

on the! ash < > w 2 - 2 no W O 5 | < O t W O

E — 6... yyy „Yo

AAA, < I 7

%

< 7) ©

M PA ru

Oh.

"II

SPETSHRAN

SENSATIONAL MEMOIRS

LAVRENTY

"Would like to live

UDC 93/94

BBK 63.3(2) B 48 Design of the series by S. Kurbatova Beria L.P.

B 48 "I wish I could live another 20 years!" Beria's last entries / Lavrenty Beria. — M. : Yauza-press, 2012. — 224 p. — (Spetskhran. Sensational memoirs).

Computer 978-5-9955-0405-4

MAJOR HISTORICAL SENSATION! The last book of L.P. Beria, supplementing the publication of his personal diaries. These are not memoirs (Lavrenty Pavlovich was thinking more not about the past, but about the future of the USSR) and not a dying confession (the atheist Beria did not think in such categories), but a POLITICAL TESTAMENT of the greatest statesman of the Stalin era, who was not only "the best 20th century manager. but also a "brilliant systems analyst." Reading Beria, you understand what an irreparable loss for Russia was his murder by enemies of the people.

"It would be nice to live at least 20 more years. It's the devil knows what we can do in these 20 years! By 1964 we will have completed the sixth five-year plan and by about 1970 we can have such a material level that even the American worker will envy ... Comrade, Stalin sets the great task of achieving a 5-hour working day. If we succeed, it will be a great upheaval. We will bypass capitalism on this alone, they can't do that, give them profit, and give them workers - but how Russians can in 5 hours, and live hurriedly. No, give us socialism and Soviet power too, we also want to live like people. This will be a peaceful offensive

communism..." UDC 93/94

BBK 63.3(2)

© S. Kremlev, note. comments, 2012

UVM 978-5-9955-0405-4 © 000 Yauza-press, 2012

Publisher's FOREWORD

The publication of this book completes the publication of the personal notes of Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria, which began with the publication of his secret diaries of 1938-1953 and then, separately, undated autobiographical materials, etc. character.

Diaries L.P. Beria, prepared by me for publication with detailed comments, made up three separate volumes. The fourth volume "Without Stalin there would be no Russia" contained various records of the post-war years. According to their content, it can be assumed that Beria himself considered them as something like sketches for future memoirs. Among these materials were also interesting sketches of a number of political portraits (including Trotsky, Bukharin, Kirov, Ordzhonikidze, etc.), as well as notes about Stalin, the Soviet Atomic Project, the role of nuclear weapons and etc.

In this fifth and final volume, which completes the publication of L.P. Beria, his notes concerning the development of socialism, the fate of socialism and the Soviet Union, etc. are given.

In notes that have the character of conceptual reflections, L.P. Beria acts, in fact, as a thoughtful and talented systems analyst,

obviously having a taste for analysis and theoretical understanding of the fundamental phenomena of society. For those who still list Beria in the department of executioners, this may seem incredible. But that's just the way it is. Looking ahead, I will inform you that the reader will find an unexpected, but competent confirmation of the high intellectual level of Beria in the afterword to the book. And in this sense, the last volume of L.P. Beria can be considered sensational. It shows that Beria was not only an outstanding manager of the era, but also its outstanding intellectual.

Despite the lack of dating, from the context of the era to which the notes refer, it is clear that they were mostly made no later than the late 40s and early 50s, including during the period of preparation for the 19th Party Congress and after XIX Congress, yes. This congress, which escaped the attention of modern historiographers, but was systemically important, was convened as the next congress of the CPSU (b), and ended as a congress of the CPSU - the party received a new name.

As subsequent events in the second half of the 50s showed, the former Bolshevik Party received soon after the twentieth. congress and new content — more and more contrary to the interests of the peoples of the USSR and socialism. In view of the above, the notes of L.P. Beria concerning the preparations for the 19th Congress, as well as relating to the time immediately after the 19th Congress of the CPSU, that is, to the autumn of 1952 and the beginning of 1953, are very interesting.

Most likely, the reader of this fifth and last book is somehow aware of the semi-detective history of the appearance in my possession of the text of the diaries and undated materials of L.P. Beria, so I won't retell it for the fifth time, but

I'm just referring those who are unfamiliar with this story to the previous books. I will only inform you that when I came to grips with the processing of the materials of the diaries, I did not immediately begin to include the rest of the entries in agreement with the publishing house. In my opinion, they required a separate and calm consideration and reflection.

Only some time later, a new work began, no less interesting, but much, as I thought at first, less tiring - now there was no need to compare dates, facts, etc. But after the fourth volume of L.P. Beria - commented on and so on. — was ready and put into production, I had to admit that this work was not simple and fast either. As, however, and work on the preparation of the fifth, last volume.

The publication of three volumes of Beria's diaries with my notes and comments caused a lot of heated and most often incorrect discussions, especially on the Internet. Obviously, the publication of the fourth and this fifth volume of undated materials by L.P. Beria will give a reason

for new discussions. Well, well, I already wrote and I can only repeat that I would be grateful for any correct comments, but on the merits.

The currently published materials contain reflections of L.P. Beria about the tasks of the USSR and the problems of state building, a presentation of his views on some theoretical issues. At first glance, such theoretical research by a great practitioner may seem strange and implausible. However, in fact, everything is quite understandable!

After the 19th Congress, L.P. Beria was included in the Commission for processing, and in fact - according to the

7

botke of the new Party Program. And that, in and of itself, speaks volumes. I will dwell on this point in more detail in due time and in its own place. Let me just say that Beria was, speaking in the language of modern, a brilliant systems analyst, and Stalin, who himself was fluent in methods of system analysis, understood and appreciated it.

A few words about the introductory essay on the 19th Congress of the CPSU following this preface. The need for such an essay became obvious to me from a certain moment. After all, the last six months of the directly Stalinist era — the time from September 1952 to the beginning of March 1953 — still remain historical and political “terra incognita”! In an honest, that is, serious and objective way, no one has yet investigated them.

In the preface to the fourth volume of L.P. Beria, I already wrote that, reading Beria's notes and reflections, I began to look at something in a new way, finally affirmed something, casting aside doubts, and thought about something, not finding a clear answer to the questions that arose. And naturally, the decision came to anticipate the publication of the text itself, which belongs to the pen of L.P. Beria, an introductory essay on the 19th Congress with at least a brief analysis of a number of points related to it.

I think it's easier to record L.P. Beria is truly interesting for the general reader. If the reader has at least a general idea of what was characteristic of that period of our history, he will also better understand why the great practitioner of socialist construction, who was up to his ears in current concrete affairs, was suddenly drawn to theoretical delights.

So, Lavrenty Beria, Stalin's closest and most talented comrade-in-arms, left behind not only personal diaries, but also interesting thoughts of a general nature, which I would call reflections on the margins of the era,

As in the preparation of the fourth volume, I included in the fifth volume the texts of L.P. Beria, at one time published in the Pravda newspaper. In addition, the appendix contains a number of materials from the 19th Congress of the CPSU: brief extracts from the Directives on the fifth 5-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR, fragments of speeches by Ekaterina Furtseva, then secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, and Alexander Poskrebyshev, Stalin's secretary.

The closing remarks by I.V. Stalin at the closing of the 19th Congress. This last public speech of his turned out to be in fact his political testament.

## 19TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU(B)-CPSU IS A FAILED TRIUMPH OF SOCIALISM

In world history, we can find events that contemporaries considered outstanding, but in fact these events turned out to be passing, secondary. As an example, I can cite the proclamation of Louis Bonaparte as Emperor of France by Napoleon III or the 300th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty, celebrated in the Russian Empire, already internally rotten, with great pomp.

On the other hand, in the same world history, we can find events that contemporaries considered outstanding, which over time were considered insignificant, but which in fact were really of the utmost importance for subsequent world development. I include the 19th Congress of the CPSU, which took place in Moscow in October 1952, among such events.

If the line of the 20th, but the 19th Congress of the CPSU had been implemented in the USSR, then the 20th Congress itself would have had a different meaning, and the world would have developed differently — not negatively, not more and more stupid and rotten, but more intelligent and creative.

The fact that the 19th Congress was a kind of frontier can be understood at least from the fact that it was convened as a congress

10

VKP(b) - the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), and entered the history of the party as the 19th Congress of the CPSU, since at this congress the Bolshevik Party was renamed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And although this act was carried out not only with the consent, but also at the initiative of Stalin himself, it later had, after Stalin's death, an extremely negative significance for the fate of socialism in the USSR.

Yes, the 19th Congress was conceived as a milestone and became a milestone, but this milestone turned out to be a political watershed between the quite possible and irrevocable triumph of socialism and the gradual collapse of socialism that had actually begun.

At the 19th Congress, for the first time, as a task of a near historical perspective, the task of building a communist society in the USSR was set, despite the existing capitalist encirclement. And such a task was, in fact, not so unrealistic. Moreover, it was, in principle, quite feasible - for nothing that the "Khrushchev" Extraordinary 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, which formally set the same task, transferred it to the plane not of real politics, but of empty schemery.

Stalin took part in the work of the 19th Congress for the last time, and although the report of the Central Committee de la Malenkov, Stalin played the main role in the preparation of the report, and at the end of the congress he delivered a speech that turned out to be something like his political testament .

I say "something like" because Stalin, addressing the congress delegates, the party members, the peoples of the USSR and the world, of course, did not think and did not guess that he had only less than five months left to live. Therefore, in his speech, he touched, although

eleven

actual aspects of the life of the USSR and the world, but far from all, which he would not have allowed if he really addressed humanity with his last word.

Stalin's true political testament - although he did not consider this work as his last - was his work "Economic Problems of Socialism", published in Pravda just on the eve of the 19th Congress.

Stalin deliberately included in the title of his work not the words "Economic successes..." and not the words "Economic tasks...", but the words "Economic problems of socialism".

By this he emphasized that after all the successes of socialism, after all the tasks successfully solved by socialism, a number of such problems arose in the socialist Soviet Union and in the emerging world socialist system, on the solution or non-solution of which depends the fate of both socialism and Russia. , and peace.

Official propaganda immediately rated this work of Stalin as brilliant, and this work of Stalin was really brilliant, but both then, in real time, and in that

later, the essence of her genius was never truly understood and not fully appreciated.

In the same way, we still do not fully realize the historical role and historical potential of the 19th Congress of the CPSU.

We well understand the destructive meaning of the final of the 20th Congress of 1956, when Khrutsev announced the report "On the Consequences of Stalin's Personality Cult" through Khrutsev.

More or less clear is the dramatic "extraordinary" XX Congress of 1959, which continued the line of the XX Congress towards the then "de-Stalinization",

12

tantamount to undermining the Russian Soviet state.

The last "Khrushchev" - the XXII Congress of the CPSU was an insignificant mixture of genres - it contained elements of drama, comedy, and farce.

The 23rd Congress and subsequent "Brezhnev" congresses of the CPSU are no longer a drama, but cardboard farces that ended in the tragic farce of Gorbachev's edition of Brezhnevism.

Here everything is more or less clear.

The 19th Party Congress still remains in the shadows. But in vain!

Therefore, I want to tell the reader at least something about that long-standing congress, either lost or deliberately lost in the annals of our recent history...

The next 19th Congress of the Communist Party opened on October 5, 1952. As already mentioned, it was convened as a congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) - VKP (b), and closed already as a congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - CPSU.

The renaming itself was, on the one hand, "significant", and on the other hand, logical and understandable. The former name of the party came from the era of political struggle, discussions, splits on the most important theoretical and practical issues of the party's activities and tasks. By the beginning of the 1950s, the communists had become not just a leading political, but a leading state force. The party dealt with vital questions of organizing all aspects of the life of Soviet society.

Already the previous 18th Congress of the CPSU(b) was held in March 1939 and had a completely businesslike character. The double-dealing opposition was eliminated

13

Van, the most dangerous conspiracies against the Soviet state have been uncovered and also liquidated. It was possible to engage not in political struggle, but in normal state and economic construction, to which the main attention was paid at the congress. The 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks approved the 3rd Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1938-1942.

At the beginning of 1941, the 18th All-Union Conference of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks was held - the last pre-war highest party meeting of the Bolshevik Party. It also had the character of a top business conference.

And soon the war began, and the real management of society increasingly began to move from the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks to such an emergency, but completely state, and not a party body, as the State Defense Committee. However, the moral influence of the communists in society did not decrease, but increased, and this was manifested primarily in the fact that joining the ranks

Communists became a mass phenomenon at the front, although the front-line communist had the only privilege - to be the first to attack.

Many communists died, but new fighters joined the party, and the formula: "If I die, please consider me a communist" was by no means an invention of Agitprop. It was an exciting detail of the real history of Russia.

Nevertheless, already in the course of the war it became clear that a new cadre of leaders had grown up in the country who, on the one hand, consider themselves flesh and blood of Soviet power (yes, it was so!), but on the other hand, they do not work in party bodies, and in the national economy and state administration bodies, including in the bodies of the Soviet

14

authorities. These cadres, brought up by socialism and the Soviet government, understood special, professional questions better than "pure" party workers, and politically they were quite mature.

With this in mind, it was possible and necessary to put forward the state leadership, from giving the role of the mind of society to it, leaving the role of "honor and conscience" of the era to the party.

Understanding this, Stalin was in no hurry to convene the next congress of the CPSU(b) after the end of the war — the priority tasks were clear even without discussion. However, years have passed, and thirteen years have passed since the last congress, which had the right, in particular, to re-elect the highest bodies of the party and change the program and rules. The convocation of the next congress is overdue.

The nature of the congress was clear in advance - it was supposed to be a report on what had been done and give a clear state and public perspective for the future, embodied in specific, repeatedly calculated economic projects.

Once upon a time, party congresses were held in an atmosphere sometimes very tense and tough, which was also understandable. The Trotskyists, the "left" Zinovievites, the "right" Bukharinites, the "workers' opposition", the "new opposition", the "Stalinist core of the Central Committee" — at one time all this determined the toughness of the confrontation almost to the point of fights.

Now all this was in the past, and the tone of the reports was no longer cocky. The secretaries of the republican Central Committees and regional committees, chairmen of the republican Councils of Ministers and allied ministers spoke... Ukrainian secretary Melnikov, Azerbaijani secretary Bagirov, Lithuanian secretary Snechkus, Moldavian secretary Brezh

15

Nev, the first secretary of the regional committee from Leningrad Andrianov...

Speakers were Minister of Oil Baibakov, Minister of Ferrous Metallurgy Tevosyan, Minister of Shipbuilding Malyshev, Secretary of the Moscow City Committee Furtseva, Marshal Vasilevsky, and writer Korney.

Anastas Mikoyan made an extensive speech, in fact, with a program in the field of food policy, food and light industry. It was, by the way, a very important speech, and its huge volume itself should have shown that, having solved the main tasks of the post-war reconstruction of Russia and ensuring its nuclear defense, the Soviet government is seriously taking up the development of the mundane side of life.

However, I have run ahead of myself, but I ought to go back to the time of the convocation of the congress...

As already mentioned, thirteen years passed between the last, last pre-war, 18th Congress and the forthcoming, first post-war, 19th Congress, but what years! The party congress was not convened

for a long time, but was it really necessary to assemble it in accordance with the formal statutory requirements at a time when the immediate tasks of the party were extremely clear: first win the war, then restore what was destroyed?

Now, enough problems have accumulated for discussion, and on Wednesday, August 20, 1952, the issue of Pravda 235 came out with a cap in the right corner:

"The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks decided to convene on October 5, 1952 the next 19th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks."

Below went:

16

"For the information of all organizations of the CPSU (b). A few days ago, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks took place in Moscow. The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks decided to convene on October 5, 1952, the next 19th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks.

The order of the day of the 19th Congress:

1. Report of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks - speaker Secretary of the Central Committee Comrade. Malenkov G.M.
2. Report of the Central Auditing Commission - Rapporteur Chairman of the Auditing Commission Comrade. Moskatov P.G.
3. Directives of the 19th Party Congress on the Fifth Five-Year Plan for the Development of the USSR for 1951-1955 - Speaker Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR Comrade. Saburov M.Z.
4. Changes in the Rules of the CPSU(b) - speaker Secretary of the Central Committee, comrade. Khrushchev N.S.
5. Elections of the central organs of the party.

<...>

Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks I. Stalin \*

Of course, not only the whole country was waiting for the opening of the congress - the event had an obvious global potential. And outwardly everything went as it was stated in the resolution of the Central Committee, published on August 20, - the 19th Congress of the CPSU (b) was held in Moscow from October 5 to October 14, 1952. By that time, the number of party members had reached 6 million, plus about 870 candidate members of the CPSU(b).

Delegations from 44 communist and workers' parties arrived in Moscow as guests of the 19th Congress. The last detail was completely new for Party congresses.

The first meeting of the congress opened in the morning in the Grand Kremlin Palace. Not only the whole country was represented here - "from Moscow to

17

to the outskirts." The position of the USSR in the post-war world has changed fundamentally - we have become a truly great world power, a leader for powerful international forces and for a number of states. In the Kremlin Hall, no longer hidden, but openly sat actually state delegations of communists from Poland, the GDR, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Albania, China, People's Korea, Vietnam, Mongolia...

There were many delegations of communist parties from capitalist countries.

Malenkov delivered the Report of the Central Committee. Today, it is not uncommon to assert that Malenkov's performance instead of Stalin supposedly made him the new first secretary under the living Stalin, "and perhaps even the sole leader in a narrow leadership."

However, the Report Report was not a report of Stalin or Malenkov, but a report of the Central Committee, many people worked on it, including, of course, first of all, Stalin, who was also the final editor of the report. At the same time, it was clear that standing for several hours and reading out a report would be more than tiring for Stalin, and there was no need for that.

Another thing is that the appointment of a member of the Politburo, Secretary of the Central Committee Malenkov, and not a member of the Politburo, Secretary of the Central Committee Khrushchev, as a speaker showed that in the eyes of Stalin, Malenkov was seen as the most important figure in a purely party leadership.

In his book "Why was Stalin killed?" I was skeptical about the statement of such a dubious "historian" as Zhores Medvedev, who claimed that the appointment of Malenkov as a speaker from the Central Committee was "obvious evidence that it was Malenkov who was the formal successor

18

Nickname of Stalin in the CPSU (b). But here I, perhaps, was mistaken - in this case with Medvedev you can agree.

I think Stalin always understood that Malenkov's potential was clearly higher than Khrushchev's, and much more so. But it seems that by the autumn of 1952, Stalin began to think more and more about whether Khrushchev had at least some development potential adequate to the tasks of the era? So the order to make a report to the Central Committee to Malenkov was, most likely, not technical, but "significant" moment.

The report of the Central Committee was traditionally divided into three parts: the international situation, the internal situation, and questions of party life. Moreover, in each of the parts one could feel not just the presence of Stalin, but his conceptual supremacy.

The report said:

"The position of the USSR in relation to the USA, England, France and other bourgeois states is clear... The USSR is even now ready to cooperate with these states, having in mind the observance of peaceful international norms and ensuring a lasting and lasting peace... Soviet policy peace and security of peoples proceeds from the fact that the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism and cooperation are quite possible...

Even now, more sober and progressive politicians... not blinded by anti-Soviet enmity, clearly see into what abyss the presumptuous American adventurers are dragging them, and begin to oppose the war... Having embarked on this new path, European and others countries will meet with full understanding from all peace-loving countries ... "

19

The report of the Central Committee also spoke about the fact that the economy of the USA and other Western countries is in stagnation... At the same time, in the "internal" section, it was said about the rapid development of the economy of the USSR.

Today, for example, a good historian Yuri Zhukov is ironic about this, but that's how it was then. Even the United States, having sucked for the second time the gold, blood and sweat of the peoples due to the world war organized by the Golden Elite, was not able to maintain relatively high standards of mass consumption without the militarization of the economy and without constant replenishment from the outside, provided by the systemic exploitation of the rest of the world.

In order not to be unfounded, I will refer to an article with the demonstrative title "War as a Means of Saving the American Economy," published by political scientist Vitaly Shlykov in



the weekly Military Industrial Courier (No. 43-44, 2001). The author writes:

"..Now it is already forgotten that it was the Soviet planned system that at that time (in the 1930s – S.K.) was a role model for many American citizens. Here are the titles of only a few books published in the United States in 1932 and dedicated to the USSR: Joseph Freeman's The Soviet Worker, Waldo Franko's Dawn in Russia, William Foster's Path to Soviet America, Kirby Page's The New Economic Order, Socialist planning" by Harry Leidler, "Russia today: what can we learn from it?" Sherwood Eddie...

and further:

"The United States emerged from the depression not according to the New Deal proposed by Roosevelt, but thanks to the creation

20

given under his leadership to the system of mobilization restructuring of the economy during the Second World War".

An extremely curious, and most importantly, true statement. At the same time, Vitaly Shlykov refers to the words of the famous economist John Maynard Keynes, who on July 29, 1940 in the New Republic magazine told the Americans:

"Not only will your military preparations not require sacrifices from you. On the contrary, they will provide that incentive to increase individual consumption and raise living standards that neither the victory nor the defeat of the New Deal could give you.

I don't know whether the bourgeois economist Keynes himself understood that these words of his were in fact the final and irrevocable verdict on the entire system of capitalism, because it was clearly and openly said here that from now on capitalism cannot flourish except on the blood and suffering of the people. - Dov. For America, the militarization of the economy has been and remains a source of profit for the elite and a stable existence for the mass consumer in the leading (that is, the most gangster) capitalist countries.

And the USSR of Stalin and Beria has changed over the seven post-war years, demilitarizing the economy!

It was no longer the ruins that determined the appearance of its cities and villages in the former occupied territories. Gone are the first post-war famine years. The population grew rapidly, and children in an atmosphere of social insecurity and pessimism are not willingly given birth. Universities graduated up to 200 thousand graduates

21

per year, to which were added about 300 thousand new graduates of technical schools.

"Significant" was also that part of the Report of the Central Committee, where it was directly said about the manifestations of corruption. As an example, the Ulyanovsk party organization was cited, where, as the report of the Central Committee reported: "Part of the economic, Soviet and party workers from the leading elite of the regional organization morally decomposed, embarked on the path of embezzlement, pilfering and plundering state property."

The report stated:

"A certain danger has arisen of detachment of the party bodies from the masses and their transformation from bodies of political leadership ... into a kind of administrative and administrative institutions ... <...> The party needs officials who are not hardened and indifferent, who prefer personal tranquility to the interests of the cause but tireless and selfless fighters for the fulfillment of the directives of the party and the government, putting state interests above all else..."

And then Malenkov declared:

"At the helm of leadership in industry and agriculture, in the party and state apparatus should be cultured people, experts in their field."

For all sorts of bastards, mediocrity and self-seekers, these words resounded like a death knell. And for the active part of the masses - the party and non-Party - they sounded like a military call.

22

After Malenkov, Saburov, chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR, made a keynote speech on the five-year plan. The reading of the draft Directives under the five-year plan was lengthy, because the plan was not only impressive - the control figures depicted a qualitatively different country.

For the first time in the history of the USSR, almost equal rates of production of means of production (Group A) - 13% and production of consumer goods (Group B) - 11% were envisaged. Everything was logical here — having created an industrial basis for the growth of prosperity, it was necessary to create this prosperity. It was also necessary to determine the prospects for the development of the country as a whole.

According to Saburov's report, the congress adopted Directives on the fifth five-year plan for the development of the USSR for 1951-1955.

This is not the first time I have written about the 19th Congress of the CPSU and I have already written that on October 7, 1952, L.P. Beria, as well as the fact that the historian Yury Zhukov saw in Malenkov's report and Beria's speech a kind of hidden struggle between the "hawk" Beria and almost the "dove" Malenkov.

In reality, neither Beria was a "hawk" nor Malenkov was a "dove." Both, like Stalin, understood that only one course was reasonable for the USSR - towards peaceful coexistence, ensured by powerful and modern Soviet Armed Forces.

Yes, Beria said that the United States "is more afraid of peace than of war, although there is no doubt that, by unleashing a war, they will only hasten their collapse and their death." But from whose lips, if not from the lips of the head of the Soviet Atomic Project, America should have heard a completely appropriate warning.

nie regarding the inappropriateness of military adventures against the USSR?

Khrushchev made a report on changes in the Charter of the CPSU(b). Among other decisions on Khrushchev's report, a decision was made to rename the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) into the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - I have already mentioned this above.

Some of the modern researchers, for example, Rudolf Balandin, see in this decision Stalin's desire to belittle the status of the party, reducing it with such a name to the level of almost a Union ministry. However, everything was clearly explained by what it was explained at the congress. And there it was said that the presence of the letter "b" in brackets in the name of the party became an anachronism, which caused the need to rename.

The new name of the party turned out to be even more weighty. Another thing is that immediately after the death of Stalin and Beria, Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites, together with agents of influence from the West, began to gradually emasculate the party and eradicate the spirit of Bolshevism from it, that is, truthfulness, adherence to principles and the absolute priority of the public over the personal.

On October 14, 1952, Stalin made his final speech at the congress. At that 19th Congress of the CPSU ended, however, the country was supposed to start a new era, opened by this congress.

Among other things, in the near future, a new edition of the Program of the CPSU, and in fact, a new Program, was to be developed and adopted.

In the preface, I dwelled in detail on such a moment as the formation at the congress of the Commission for the revision of the Party Program under the chairmanship of I.V. Stalin.

24

Here I emphasize once again that the presence of Beria in the Commission can be considered "significant" - in the sense that Beria turned out to be attracted by Stalin to the most important not only ideological, but also theoretical action of the party!

The commission included five "pure" theorists (O.V. Kuusinen, P.N. Pospelov, A.M. Rumyantsev, D.I. Chesnokov, P.F. Yudin), the chief (after Stalin) the official "ideologist" Malenkov, as well as M.Z. Saburov, who previously worked a lot in the field of "clean", again, ideology.

From the closest Stalinist "team" - Kaganovich, Molotov and ...

And Beria.

Moreover, the best manager of socialism was not a "wedding general" in this conceptual team - Stalin did not have sinecures as a custom.

Let me also remind you that Beria entered the Commission, who was not daily occupied with ideological issues, but there was no "pure" party leader Khrushchev. It is unlikely that this was accidental, and it is unlikely that this pleased Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites. Stalin gradually put Nikita Sergeevich in his "legitimate" place of an operational officer, who can still quite energetically deal with current affairs, but nothing more.

In other words, Stalin was no longer delusional about Khrushchev's business qualities. However, alas, he was tragically mistaken about Khrushchev's personal qualities, not seeing his future Judas in him.

Potentially very important were the personnel results of the congress — after it, the composition of the Central Committee of the CPSU became younger and expanded.

The Plenum of the Central Committee, held on October 16, 1952, elected instead of the old Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks a new one.

The Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU in such an unprecedented number of members - together with candidate members, the Presidium of the Central Committee was expanded to 36 people!

Many new candidates were proposed by Stalin, and personally the composition of the Presidium looked like this: V.M. Andrianov, A.B. Aristov, L.P. Beria, N.A. Bulganin, K.E. Voroshilov, S.D. Ignatiev, L.M. Kaganovich, D.S. Korotchenko, V.V. Kuznetsov, O.V. Kuusinen, G.M. Malenkov, V.A. Malyshev, L.G. Melnikov, A.I. Mikoyan, N.A. Mikhailov, V.M. Molotov, M.G. Pervukhin, P.K. Ponomarenko, M.Z. Saburov, I.V. Stalin, M.A. Suslov, N.S. Khrushchev, D.I. Chesnokov, N.M. Shvernik, M.F. Shkiryatov.

Candidates for members of the Presidium were: L.I. Brezhnev, A.Ya. Vyshinsky, A.G. Zverev, N.G. Ignatov, I.G. Kabanov, A.N. Kosygin, N.S. Patolichev, N.M. Pegov, A.M. Puzanov, I.T. Tevosyan, P.F. Yudin.

At the same time, at the suggestion of Stalin, for the prompt resolution of issues, an extra-statutory Bureau of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU was created: Beria, Bulganin, Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Malenkov, Pervukhin, Saburov, Stalin and Khrushchev.

The plenum also formed an even narrower operational body, the so-called "leading five": Beria, Bulganin, Malenkov, Stalin, Khrushchev. (Let me remind you in brackets that at the beginning of 1953, a very narrow "Troika" was formed, consisting of Beria (chairman), Malenkov and Bulganin.)

The secretariat of the Central Committee looked like this: A.B. Aristov, L.I. Brezhnev, N.G. Ignatov, G.M. Malenkov, N.A. Mikhaylov, N.M. Pegov, P.K. Ponomarenko, I.V. Stalin, M.A. Suslov, N.S. Khrushchev.

The General Secretary was not elected at the Plenum, because Stalin expressed a wish for election of a new General Secretary. However, no one agreed to this.

Such a move by Stalin is now often presented as a supposedly Jesuit "test of loyalty" of his comrades-in-arms, but Stalin never swam so shallowly. He was really tired, on the one hand, and on the other hand, as one might assume, he saw in the future a change in the position and role of the CPSU in Soviet society. And I am unlikely to be mistaken in assuming that Stalin, having abandoned the post of General Secretary of the Central Committee (this post was, after all, in fact abolished!), saw himself in the near future as Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The next session of the Supreme Soviet was approaching, and the election of Stalin as the official head of the Soviet state would automatically shift the center of power from party bodies to Soviet.

However, Stalin had a little more than four months to live. And there were reasons for this, which were clearly revealed both at the 19th Congress and after it. In the USSR, along with the very real prospects for building a communist society of democracy and abundance, the initial systemic conditions for the future collapse of socialism were also formed. And much depended on how long Stalin would live.

The three-volume "Encyclopedic Dictionary" of the 1954 edition of the 19th Congress said that it "summed up the results of the struggle and victories of the Soviet people, outlined a program for the further movement of the Soviet Union forward along the path of a gradual transition to a communist society."

In principle, this was a very real path, but only under very specific conditions and

27

with a certain line of development of Soviet society. Indeed, at the 19th Congress a lot was said not only about the results, victories and plans. It also touched upon such acute topics, which the Encyclopedic Dictionary, referring to the 19th Congress, narrated as follows:

"..The monopoly position of the CPSU, especially in the conditions of capitalist encirclement obliges to be highly vigilant against the intrigues of the class enemy. To the ruling party, as V.I. Lenin, various careerists cling to its ranks, the enemies of the people, agents of international imperialism, have tried and are trying to penetrate into its ranks for subversive enemy activities. That is why the CPSU considers it a most important task to further raise the revolution. vigilance

communists and all working people.

The fate of the party, socialism, and Russia largely depended on whether the last statement would remain a general phrase or become a guide to action.

The 19th Congress did not foreshadow any kind of external and internal bastards, nothing particularly joyful. It was clearly conceived by Stalin and his "team" as a kind of boundary between the ending mobilization period of Soviet history and the upcoming period of peaceful development.

economy and socialist democracy of the masses as guarantees against selfish degeneration of the leadership.

And one of the most important guarantees was to be the real development of criticism and self-criticism.

In an appendix to this book, I will cite a number of extracts from the materials of the 19th Congress, including from two speeches made in the debate on the reports of Malenkov and Khrushchev.

28

The young secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee Ekaterina Furtseva said:

"What kind of criticism and self-criticism can we talk about, say, at the Physical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where 102 employees are related, and some of them are directly subordinate to each other?"

Furtseva also dwelled in detail on the case of open red tape in the Ministry of the River Fleet of the USSR, where for a month they could not resolve the issue of promoting an important cargo according to a letter from the USSR State Supply Committee. Furtseva quoted bureaucratic visas to the general laughter of the hall, but under this laughter, very many were not laughing.

However, the high point of the congress in this regard was the speech on October 14 by the "shadow" of Stalin, his long-term assistant and secretary, head of the Special Sector of the Central Committee A.N. Poskrebyshev.

In a book about the assassination of Stalin, I already wrote about this speech, which even now, in a strange way, does not attract the attention of "notebook" "historians". But Poskrebyshev had never spoken publicly before, and his public speech could not but be perceived by the country otherwise than voicing the position of Stalin himself.

An analysis of the "post-skrebyshevsky" text just shows that the main blocks of the text of the speech were written by Stalin himself. Very Stalinist intonations now and then sound in this speech, dedicated to the need to strengthen party and state discipline:

"Unfortunately, we have among the party and Soviet workers (note that economic workers are not mentioned here. - S.K.) those who

some for some reason are sure that it is not they, but someone else who is obliged to comply with the laws, but that they themselves can circumvent the laws, violate or apply them at their own discretion, according to the principle: ". From such a very strange understanding of the laws, there is only one step to ... a crime ... "

Stalin said this, of course, through the mouth of Poskrebyshev. And this was done so that what was said was perceived not as a threat, but as a warning. Although the words sounded then formidable, weighty and significant:

"There are ... cases when some noble officials, abusing their power, inflict reprisals for criticism, directly or indirectly subject their subordinates to repression and persecution. (Further emphasis is mine. - S.K.) But everyone knows how severely our party and its Central Committee punish such nobles, regardless of rank, titles, or past merits ... "

Could Poskrebyshev say this? He was always emphatically modest, inconspicuous and dependent. And suddenly - such statements in the hall where the party color of the country is assembled!

Of course, Stalin said this, but he spoke through Poskrebyshev. However, precisely because it was said through the mouth of Poskrebyshev, it could be understood that Stalin did not threaten, but

warned. However, he warned seriously, in a Stalinist way. That is, firstly, with extreme restraint, which is why he instructed to say what was said to another. Second, it's significant.

And there was no doubt that all the selfish "partoplasm" - both career-wise infiltrated into the hall of the 19th Congress, and operating outside its walls - understood Stalin correctly.

Throughout his life as a statesman, Stalin struggled with arrogance and the new socialist "non-know-it-alls". For example, on April 13, 1928, at a meeting of the activists of the Moscow organization of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, he devoted a separate section of the report to self-criticism, saying, in particular, the following:

"I know that there are people in the ranks of the Party who dislike criticism in general, and self-criticism in particular. These people ... grumble: ... they say, ... can't they let us live in peace? ... I think, comrades, that we need self-criticism like air, like water ... <...>

The slogan of self-criticism received particularly strong development after the 15th Party Congress. Why? Because after the 15th Congress, which liquidated the opposition, ... the Party may be in danger of resting on its laurels. And what does it mean to rest on our laurels? This means putting an end to our forward movement. And in order to prevent this from happening, we need self-criticism, honest, open, Bolshevik ... "

Something more specific was said at the time:

"..Finally, there is one more circumstance pushing us to self-criticism. I have in mind the question of the masses and the leaders. <...> Of course, the fact that we have created a group of leaders who have risen too high and have great authority - this fact in itself is a great achievement of our Party. It is clear that without such an authoritative group of leaders to lead

31

big country is impossible. But the fact that the leaders, on their way up, move away from the masses... cannot but create a certain danger of the leaders breaking away from the masses and the masses moving away from the leaders.

This danger can lead to the fact that the leaders can become conceited and admit that they are infallible.  
my..."

Six years passed, and on January 26, 1934, in the Report of the KhUP to the Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, the General Secretary of the Central Committee was already more rigid, starting the topic as follows:

"As regards the selection of people and the mixing of those who have not justified themselves, I would like to say no  
how many words.

In addition to the incorrigible bureaucrats and clerks, on the elimination of which we have no disagreements, we have two more types of workers who slow down our work, interfere with our work ... "...

Stalin said the following about the first type:

"One type of workers are people with well-known merits in the past, people who have become grandees, people who believe that party and Soviet laws were written not for them, but for fools. These are the same people who do not consider it their duty to carry out the decisions of the Party and government and who, in this way, destroy the foundations of Party and state discipline. What are they counting on by violating Party and Soviet laws? They hope that the Soviet government will not dare to touch them because of their old merits. These arrogant nobles think that they are indispensable.. What to do with such workers? They should not hesitate to be removed from leadership positions, regardless of

on their merits in the past ... This is necessary in order to knock down arrogance from these arrogant bureaucrats and put them in their place ... "

And then Stalin spoke about the second type of worthless workers, whom he called "honest talkers", and with purely Stalinist humor he complained:

"And when you remove such talkers from their posts, they shrug and wonder: "Why are we being removed? Haven't we done everything that is necessary for the cause, haven't we called a rally of shock workers, haven't we proclaimed the slogans of the party and the government at the conference of shock workers. Didn't we elect the entire Politburo of the Central Committee to the honorary presidium, didn't we send greetings to Comrade Stalin—what else do you want from us?"

These Stalin also recommended that they be removed from leadership positions in 1934. Three years later, in 1937, it was not always possible to limit oneself only to removal from posts ...

When comparing the speeches of Stalin in 1934 and Poskrebyshev in 1952, it is impossible not to notice a clear textual similarity. Those of the "leaders" of the 1952 model to whom these words were applicable, of course, noticed him. And if someone would not have noticed, then the referents would immediately have drawn the attention of the "noble" "boss" to this similarity. Here, they say, is what Alexander Nikolaevich Poskrebyshev said, and here is what is said on pages 369-372 of the thirteenth volume of Comrade Stalin's Works, published only a year ago, in 1951.

Through the mouth of Poskrebyshev, Stalin did not frighten, but warned. Alas, as the coming months have shown, the various careerists in the leadership are now

33

Already the CPSU, as well as the enemies of the people, agents of international imperialism, who penetrated the CPSU for subversive activities, managed to forestall Stalin and remove him from the political life of the USSR literally on the eve of his decisive political reforms.

And the 19th Congress of the CPSU turned out to be in fact the last congress of Soviet communists.

The last one, and because it was the last time that Communist No. 1 Stalin took part in it - not only the great leader of the masses, but also the last great Marxist of the world.

The 19th Congress was also the last congress of communists because it was the last time that tasks were set solely in the interests of the all-round development and strengthening of Soviet society and socialism.

Ordinary communist delegates to the congress, as well as members of the highest Stalinist leadership loyal to Stalin and the cause of socialism, thought that the party had only been renamed, but retained its people's essence. Alas, it turned out that soon after the 19th Congress the party was actually mortally wounded. Already the next, "Khrushchev's" 20th congress was not another congress of communists of the Leninist-Stalinist formation, but the first congress of the triumphant partocracy, the strengthening of future degenerates.

A few words must also be said about the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU that took place immediately after the October 1952 congress. Strangely, there is no transcript of it in the archives. Most likely, it was destroyed after the double murder of Stalin and Beria. However, the delegate of the 19th Congress, who was elected a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Leonid Nikolaevich Efremov, recorded Stalin's speech at the plenum

34

(I give extracts from it according to the 18th volume of the Collected Works of I.V. Stalin, published by the prominent Marxist scholar Richard Ivanovich Kosolapov).

Stalin said then:

"So, we held a party congress. It went well, and it may seem to many that we have complete unity. However, we do not have such unity. Some express disagreement with our decisions.

They say: why did we significantly expand the composition of the Central Committee? But isn't it clear that new forces had to be poured into the Central Committee? We, the old people, will all perish, but we need to think to whom, into whose hands we will hand over the baton of our great cause. Who will carry it forward? This requires younger, more dedicated people, politicians. And what does it mean to raise a political, statesman? This requires great effort. It will take ten years, no, all fifteen years, to educate a statesman.

But desire alone is not enough. It is possible to educate ideologically steadfast statesmen only through practical deeds..."

In fact, Stalin here continued the thoughts that were expressed by him in Economic Problems, but then he said even more interestingly:

"They ask why we dismissed prominent party and statesmen from important ministerial posts. What can be said about this? We dismissed the ministers Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and others and replaced them with new workers. Why? On what basis? The work of a minister is a peasant's work. It requires great strength, specific knowledge

and health. That is why we have relieved some honored comrades of their posts and appointed new, more qualified, enterprising workers in their place. They are young people, full of strength and energy...

As for the prominent political and statesmen themselves, they remain prominent political and statesmen...>

Undoubtedly, Stalin planned after the congress a number of serious reforms of the Soviet system, aimed, on the one hand, at tightening the requirements for leadership at all levels, and on the other hand, at the mass level, at expanding socialist democracy and strengthening the role of the masses in society. .

Moreover, there is every reason to believe that in the implementation of his plans, Stalin did not intend to rely primarily on Beria and Malenkov. With such a "coach" as Comrade Stalin, this "tan dem" could achieve a lot...

If Stalin had time to carry out his reforms, it is unlikely that the enemies of the people would have been able to successfully play their black games. However, Stalin did not have time, and they played them - in 1956, in 1957, and so on - until 1991, marked by the Cain seal on Gorbachev's bald head.

The principle of criticism was in Stalin's USSR not a bare phrase. And in the first years after Stalin's death, he was also not a mere phrase, which is very clearly seen from the critical remarks of the army communists in the Strategic Missile Forces, expressed at party meetings even in the second half of the 50s, addressed to the leadership, up to the commander of the Strategic Missile Forces, Marshal Nedelin .

Thus, the head of the political department of the Central Directorates of the USSR Ministry of Defense V.V. Semyonov on December 17, 1957, in a memorandum No. 937048 with the head of the Administrative Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU V.V. Zolotukhi wrote:

"..At the party meeting of the 6th Directorate, it was noted that Marshal Nedelin, to whom it is subordinate, .. allows immodesty. So, a special solid house was built for him at the training ground. The house is empty... The Communists asked that this house be given over to housing officers or an orphanage...



“At a party meeting... the head of the unit, Major General Semyonov, and the deputy head of the unit, Major General Mrykin, were sharply criticized for their lordly attitude towards subordinates, for belittling the party organization...”

January 2, 1958 Minister of Defense of the USSR R.Ya. Malinovsky and the head of the Main Political Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Defense A.S. Zheltov, in a memorandum to the Central Committee of the CPSU No. 168517ss, reported on the critical remarks of officers against the leadership of the Ministry of Defense, including against the head of the 6th Directorate, Lieutenant General Bolyatko, and the head of the Central State Testing Ground, Colonel General Voznyuk .

General Voznyuk, for example, built himself a villa worth 548 thousand rubles, and handed over his good house with a garden to his relative, Lieutenant Colonel Tokarev, appointing him to an engineering position with a seven-year education.

These were the flowers of Khrushchevism, followed by the berries of Brezhnevism. But the fact that senior communist officers dared to openly criticize their generals in the 1950s was an echo of

37

of the outgoing Stalin era — tough and uncompromising.

At the same time, it was also a sign of a new era of hopes for the flourishing of socialism and socialist democracy.

Yes, in the 50s in the USSR, in addition to dark intrigues, creative processes also developed, new generations grew up - this is also in the notes of L.P. Beria. And with the right line in the life of society, this generation of post-war enthusiasts had excellent prospects within the framework of socialist democratization, the main ideologist and practitioner of which was always Stalin in the country, but Beria could also become.

Once I already quoted a textbook by V.A. Karpinsky for the 7th grade of the secondary school "The Constitution of the USSR". On June 3, 1953, its fourth edition was signed for publication, with a circulation of two million copies. There it was said:

“The Constitution provided Soviet citizens with the inviolability of the person, home, and the secrecy of correspondence (Articles 127, 128). No one in the Soviet Union can be arrested without a court order or a prosecutor's permission. Representatives of state power may enter a citizen's dwelling without his consent only in cases specified in the law...”

Will a political system oriented towards arbitrariness and lawlessness take care that in a normative way, teaching it as a subject in a public school, instill such thoughts in young minds?

38

Is something like this possible today in “Russian” schools, where they begin to teach all sorts of “basics of survival”?

Will the tyrant strive to ensure that the masses of the people are fully educated? Educated in such a way that the very concept of the elite disappears, because each member of society is comprehensively developed ... Because, having united with other comprehensively developed individuals, he will no longer allow anyone to pose as the “quintessence”, “cream of society” , "servants of the people", "salt of the earth", etc.?

No - a thinking, educated, developed people is mortally dangerous for a tyrant. And Stalin, on the eve of the 19th Congress, in his "Economic Laws of Socialism", put forward the following conceptual base of socialist democratization:

"It is necessary ... to achieve such a cultural growth of society that would ensure to all members of society the comprehensive development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to receive an education sufficient to become active agents of social development, so that they have the opportunity to freely choose a profession, and not be chained for life, due to the existing division of labor, to any one profession.

What is required for this?

It would be wrong to think that such a serious cultural growth of the members of society can be achieved without serious changes in the present state of work. To do this, it is necessary first of all to reduce the working day to at least 6, and then to 5 hours. This is necessary to ensure that members of the society have enough free time necessary to receive comprehensive

his education. For this, it is necessary, further, to introduce compulsory polytechnic education... To this end, it is necessary, further, to radically improve housing conditions and raise the real wages of workers and employees at least twice, if not more, as by directly raising money wages, and, especially, by a further systematic reduction in the prices of consumer goods.

These are the basic conditions for preparing the transition

to communism...

This is what Stalin came with to that 19th party congress, which became its first post-war congress and the last congress that the Bolshevik Party convened. Moreover, in such a vision of the promising social development of Russia and mankind, the politician Stalin was one with the physicist Einstein, who, five years before the 19th Congress, in 1947, in his essay "Why socialism wrote:

"The economic anarchy of the capitalist system ... is the true root of evil ... I am convinced that there is only one way to combat this grave evil - the introduction of a socialist economy along with an education system (emphasis mine. - S.K.), aimed at the good society..."

Already in the second half of the 1930s, Stalin sought to reverse the role of the Party and the Soviets. However, the historical situation was not very conducive to this. Sometime after the war, at the end of the 1940s, during a friendly dinner at a "nearby" dacha in honor of a delegation from one of the people's democracies, Stalin responded to a flattering statement that "Soviet experience in

40

structure of socialist democracy," he said in the sense that we ourselves are just beginning to build a democratic society, that we could not even talk about any democracy in the past, because if we developed democracy, we would simply be eaten .

However, in terms of his social attitudes, Stalin was, of course, a democrat in the full and precise sense of the word, that is, a staunch supporter and conductor of the idea of state power as the power of the people (as, in fact, the Greek is translated into Russian). the word "democracy").

But socialist democracy is the power of Soviets elected by the whole people, and by the time the 19th Congress was being prepared, by 1952, a completely favorable moment had come for enhancing the role of the Soviets in state administration. With, no, not a decrease, but a change in the role of the party in governing the country. The order of the party committee was to be replaced by a morally and politically justified conviction.

At the 19th Congress, on the initiative of Stalin, many young cadres were introduced into the leadership, the reorientation of the tasks of the party from economic management to ideological management began, which was already evident from a comparison of the Charter of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, adopted by the 15th Congress in March 1939, and the Charter of the CPSU adopted by the 19th Congress.

Charter of 1939:

"The Party is the leading (emphasis in bold italics here and below mine. - S.K.) the core of all organizations of workers, both public and state, and ensures the successful construction of a communist society."

41

Charter of 1952:

"Now the main tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are to build a communist society ... to continuously raise the material and cultural level of society, to educate the members of society ..."

Moreover, if earlier the Politburo of the Central Committee was called upon to organize "political work", and the Party Control Commission controlled "the implementation of the decisions of the Party and the Central Committee ... by party organizations and Soviet economic bodies", now the Presidium of the Central Committee had to organize the current the work of the Central Committee, and the Party Control Commission under the CE was given the functions of controlling purely internal party affairs.

There is no doubt that the revision of the Program of the CPSU would have gone exactly in this direction and would have deepened the ideas of socialist democracy. And the inclusion of Beria in the composition of the commission for the revision of the program showed that Stalin saw in Beria his like-minded person. After the war, it was Beria who very loudly declared that during working hours one should be engaged in state work, and not party meetings - which the bureaucratic apparatus sinned not only in the Central Committee, but also in the apparatus of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, in ministries and departments.

There is no doubt that the revision of the Program should in fact have led in a very short time to the development of a new program of the CPSU. The second (first post-revolutionary) program of the party was adopted at the UIP Congress of the RCP(b) in March 1919. It's clear that

To

42

In 1952, it became outdated not only tactically, but also strategically.

Nevertheless, immediately after the assassination of Stalin and then the assassination of Beria, all work on the revision of the program was curtailed, and only in 1956 at the Twentieth Congress it was decided to develop a draft of a new, third program of the CPSU. At the same time, even three years later, the program was not ready for the Extraordinary 21st Congress of the CPSU, although the need for it was recognized as early as 1952.

Only five (!) years after the adoption of the decision of the XX Congress on the development of a new program - on July 30, 1961, its draft was published in the organ of the Central Committee - the newspaper Pravda, and on October 31, 1961 - at the XXIX Congress of the CPSU this "program of the builders of communism" was adopted, although already at that time informed people inside and outside the USSR knew that the third program of the CPSU was doomed in advance - no, not to failure, but to slaughter ...

Like the party itself, and the USSR itself, and Russia itself...

Today - in the light of the events of March and June 1953 that followed after October 1952, etc. — it can be said that the Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Ukraine (b)-CPSU can rightfully be assessed as a failed triumph of socialism.

This congress was to become the starting point for cleansing the Soviet society of the accumulated bureaucratic "scum" and for the development of socialist democracy on the basis of strengthening the role of the Soviets and broad polytechnic education of the new rising generations of Soviet people.

In reality, it turned out differently - at a distance of forty subsequent years, exactly the opposite.

43

But the development of the USSR was also possible within the framework of the ideas of the 19th Congress, the ideas of Stalin and Beria.

To understand the reasons for the failed triumph of socialism is still an unresolved task in modern Russia.

And it's time to decide.

MATERIALS FOR THE NINETH CONGRESS OF THE VKI(B)-CPSU

From the compiler and commentator:

At the 19th Congress of the CPSU (b) - CPSU L.P. Beria made a big speech. Of course, the preparation of this speech took him a lot of time and required considerable effort. But how much - personal effort?

This question is not idle, because different leaders of the USSR had a different manner of preparing public speeches.

In the time of Lenin, the concept of "speechwriter" was as alien to the leaders of the party and government as it became familiar to the leaders of the party and government during the times of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev.

The late Stalin era turned out to be transitional in this sense. Stalin himself wrote all his speeches himself, and the same could be said about many of his close associates. However, their constant workload and wide opportunities for using the apparatus led to the fact that some, for example, Khrushchev, already used the "help" of referents, secretaries, assistants with might and main. etc.

For Khrushchev, this was all the more characteristic because he himself was in great disagreement with both literary style and grammar (his famous "Aznakomitsa ..." is not an anecdote). Yes, and education did not shine, but had no inclination to self-education.

45

Beria, on the contrary, from an early age wanted to study and studied all his life, including not from textbooks, but in constant communication with prominent people, outstanding minds of the country. Moreover, his interlocutors were outstanding figures in various fields of activity, ranging from theoretical physics to culture. Therefore, Beria grew constantly.

So he also clearly wrote his speeches himself, which is also evident from his preparatory notes and the theses of his speech that are now being published. Of course, Beria used the help of his assistants to select the appropriate materials, but the basis was still his own thoughts, to which the secretaries selected figures, etc.

Today, Stalin's team is still being portrayed as a bunch of idiots who only knew how to pound the table with their fists and sign execution lists in batches. However, if one reads, for example, the memoirs and notes of Kaganovich published after 1991, one can be convinced that this former simple tanner possessed an outstanding not only

practical, but also very deep theoretical mind and was a good social analyst. No wonder Lazar Mikhailovich's library had more than tens of thousands of volumes, and he not only collected them, but read them.

In Stalin's team, this was, in fact, the norm - constantly reading, studying, thinking - despite the enormous daily workload. Alpine skiing, riding with bikers and HI-Ei audio equipment were not popular in the top management environment at that time - it was not up to that. But in questions of theory it was necessary to understand.

And Stalin's associates understood it. This is once again proved by the letters of V.M. Molotov, sent by him in 1964 to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the Khrushchev Program of the CPSU.

As the reader will see, L.P. Beria could also write to the Khrushchev Central Committee a lot of sensible questions regarding program issues. But, by the way, if Lavrenty Pavlovich had been alive in 1964 (and this would definitely mean that he

46

is among the top leaders of the USSR), then there would simply be no need for a Marxist critique of the Party Program.

Firstly, it would have been developed and adopted much earlier, and secondly, it would have been a truly Marxist program for building real mature socialism, developing into a society with strong elements of a communist character.

Below are those records of L.P. Beria, who are directly related to the preparation of the 19th Party Congress or are close to its issues.

++

Comrade Stalin in recent years has often raised the question of when the next Congress of the Party should be held. The last time we met was before the war, then the war disrupted the periodicity, but a lot of time passed after the war. But Comrade Stalin himself believed that there was no need to rush here, because before that all congresses met on a concrete basis, when big questions were brewing and it was necessary to discuss them and put new tasks before the people and the party.

And immediately after the war, the tasks were clear to everyone, it was necessary to restore the national economy to the pre-war level as quickly as possible and to surpass it as quickly as possible and move on. Internal tasks were clear even without a congress, and it was not worth the trouble to hold a congress simply because it had not been held for a long time. We adopted the five-year plan without a congress, and it was also right, because a congress immediately after the war would have been politically premature. If there is a congress, then it is necessary to sum up the results, but it is possible to sum up the results when something has been done to the end, and after the war it was necessary to do in all directions, what are the results!

47

Help from Sergei Kremlev:

Before the war, the first five-year plans were preliminary discussed at the congresses of the CPSU(b) and then considered and formalized in the form of a union law by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The third five-year plan, which ended in 1942, was interrupted by the war. After the war, the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on March 18, 1946 adopted the Law on the Fourth Five-Year Plan for the Restoration and Development of the National Economy for 1946-1950.

There were major defense tasks, primarily in the nuclear industry and jet technology, but you can't take them to the convention.

On the other hand, external tasks could not be determined so immediately, because everything was unclear here. The question of Germany did not depend on us alone, with Austria, too, in the people's democracies, too, not everything was settled at once, and it was necessary to understand what we could practically have there.

How not (so in the text. - S.K.), look, it was too early to hold a congress, because if it had been held, say, in 1948, what can we say about foreign policy? The Anglo-American bloc has the Atomic Weapon, but we did not have it and it was not clear when it would be. Anything could happen here, it's new, and there was a lot of risk.

And then in external affairs there was much that was not clear. Time passed, it is clear that without a congress it turns out not decently, so we decided to go to the congress by the fall of 1952. But we thought about it for a long time, so we also prepared for a long time, we thought a lot.

Comrade Stalin said, we have now renamed the Council of People's Commissars into the Council of Ministers, because the Council of People's Commissars is the concept of an emergency time, when the system has not yet been established. People

48

nye Commissars - this, one might consider, is history. Ministers are more suitable for a Great Power. But the Bolshevik Party—that, too, is approaching history. There was such a historical fact that the supporters of the Leninist line received a majority at the 2nd Congress. The word turned out to be good and played a big role. The Bolsheviks sounded weighty and convinced the people well.

But that's in the past. Before the revolution there was at first one RSDLP, then the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks appeared, and so it went after the revolution. At that time, it was not convenient for us to refuse the word Bolsheviks, it was politically stupid. And we have correctly preserved this word in the new name of the Party. Ilyich and I discussed this in particular, and he then said that this word alone wins the majority for us, the peasant loves to be heard, but we cannot survive without the support of the peasant. So let it be.

Then came the opposition, it was also impossible to refuse the word Bolshevik. Then the war. And now we can remove this letter, which has served the Party well, from the name, and in order to sound weighty, we point out that our Party is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It sounds too.

Everyone agrees with Comrade Stalin unanimously, because if he has already expressed an opinion, he will always think it over ten times.

The name "CPSU" will also be good and convincing.

kzh

Comrade Stalin teaches us that we need to know ten times more than what you will report on. What should I say in my report?

49

It will be necessary to say what others will not say. Malenkov will highlight the main tasks, this will be a report of the Central Committee, everything is clear here, Comrade Stalin himself and the apparatus will work here. The theses will be drafted later, after negotiations with Comrade Stalin and the others.

How is the new congress different from the previous ones? Once upon a time, we had a lot of discussion at our congresses, because there were different platforms and they were pulling in different directions. There was little sense, one nonsense. The stronger socialism was, the less shouting at the congresses and the more action. The same at the Plenums of the Central Committee, and also not on the case. Now it is calmer, all discussions are going on in a businesslike manner, there is no demagoguery. So it will be necessary to build a report without polemics, but with strong theses, so that there is a program for ourselves and for the entire USSR.

Then there is no trace of bringing controversial issues to the congress, because there will be many guests, we can no longer be petty. We must raise big questions for the future.

The past, too, must not be overlooked; how many years have passed since the last congress, how many things have changed. It must not be forgotten either. The war gave us a test, we survived. And then we had another test, for how long we would restore everything after the war. Five years have passed, twice the pre-war level. What if there was no war? After the war, the land was scorched. And without war there would be a flourishing land.

This idea also needs to be carried out.

\* \*\*

Delegations from all over the world will come to the congress. Maurice Thorez (head of the French Communist Party. — S.K.) will openly arrive and speak. And the fact

50

that Mussolini was in Italy seven years ago (so in the text. - S.K.), and now there is a major figure of Togliatti, this is also a force.

There will be Chinese. Many people will come and will come openly and even as state delegations. The one who was not there before, this is a sign of a new one. And here we chose the right time for the congress from this point of view.

Immediately after the war, we were only gaining prestige in the world, and the camp of socialism was just beginning. Then the Congress as an international event did not sound.

Now it's different.

Now we are already a real world power, they know it, they understand it and they take it into account. Hated, but considered. And there were many friends.

Now there is something to show to both enemies and friends. Previously, our congresses were our internal business, but now, whatever one may say, we are the vanguard, as Comrade Stalin says, and we have huge forces behind us, we just need to organize them correctly and use them correctly in the common interests.

Trotsky shouted about the world revolution and wanted to sacrifice Russia to the world revolution. Du cancer was also an enemy. If we worked not for the USSR, but for the world revolution, there would be neither the USSR nor the revolution now. And so this is what we have and we will have even more, if we are not fools.

Trotsky shouted that a world conflagration was needed, but why a conflagration? Fire, it means everything will burn down, why do we need it? We need to be a beacon, to shine and show the right course to others. And if they follow the right course, then we will be fine. They will sail to the light of our lighthouse, to us,  
that's what's important.

51

So the congress should help us in this, we need our friends to see that we need to be strong friends and be with the Soviet Union. They need it and we need it. We have become a force ourselves, and now they have to work with us. And they, too, will become a force.

A particularly large reserve is the colonies and dependent countries. There are more than half the world, and this is all our possible reserve, we just need to work. You won't say this directly at the congress, but it will have to be done indirectly. It is necessary to carry out the idea of the development of the socialist nations and compare them with the poor and oppressed nations. Then it immediately becomes clear.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

As the reader will see from the text of the speech at the congress, L.P. Beria really paid a lot of attention to the solution of the national question in the conditions of a multinational socialist society. Moreover, in comparison with other nations that are at levels of development similar to the socialist nations of the USSR before these nations began to develop as socialist.

But the Russian people will definitely have to say well, from the heart. As Comrade Stalin speaks of the Russian people. I have worked and still work with many, but a Russian person, if he is a strong person, there is no one better than him, and no one is more reliable. It also happens that if it's rubbish, it's not worse. But this is an exception, and if a person has a soul, then this is a good soul.

This will have to be said.

to well

In the materials of the congress, it is important to mention the question of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. But we must carefully emphasize that there should be

mutually beneficial relationship. This is difficult to do, and here I will have to argue, because we believe that here the political effect is the most important, and therefore we must help, even if it is economically unprofitable for us.

It's hard for us to take a hard line here, because America is helping Europe a lot. Help, of course, in quotes, but it works. And we still can not encourage the mood of dependents. They sit on the neck, then it will be hard to fix.

Calculations and analysis show that we have a lot of products that it is more profitable for them to get from us, because it is cheaper from us. And our market is more profitable for them, because the size is huge, and we have strong guarantees, we don't have crises. We need to press on this, otherwise if we start only about fraternal relations, then we can corrupt.

Reference and commentary by Sergei Kremlev:

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) was formed in early January 1949, consisting of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia.

On the one hand, it was a fairly natural step towards the economic integration of the countries of Eastern Europe and the USSR

On the other hand, it was a countermeasure against the American plan to help Europe - the Marshall Plan, designed for five years, from 1948 to 1952 (in fact, by the end of 1951 it was curtailed while maintaining direct American arms supplies to NATO countries). Under the Marshall Plan, economic aid from the United States went to England, France, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Austria, Ireland, Iceland, Greece, Switzerland, Turkey, Portugal, and West Germany.

The Soviet press wrote that the Marshall Plan was unprofitable for Europe and that it was destroying its economy, increasing

increases unemployment, etc. This was not untrue, but from the outside, the Marshall Plan was attractive for the masses of the European population, and for the countries of Eastern Europe that had abandoned



"help" from the United States under pressure from the USSR - seductive. Free cheese is only found in a mousetrap, but this cheese smelled very tasty, and in Europe during the war years they were starving. Therefore, Beria's anxiety was quite understandable. There were quite a few people in the CMEA countries who either wanted to join the Marshall Plan or use the rejection of this plan as a means of blackmail against the Soviet Union. Like, we refused America's help, so now help us.

There will be no overlap with others. I agreed with everyone that I would take over the national question. And there, whoever wants to, let him say what he thinks is necessary or according to Comrade Stalin's order.

Mikoyan will give a big report on the light and food industries, saying that they will lick their fingers, because in the 5-year period we will strengthen this business colossally. There will be meatballs, there will be sweets, and most importantly, we can reach decent levels of consumption if agriculture does not let us down, but there will be large investments. We will help the village hard, so that Anastas will have something to make delicacies for the people.

+ +%

It will be necessary in the report to place particular emphasis on the theory of the development of the socialist nations. Comrade Stalin wrote a lot on the national question, and Lenin wrote a lot, but this applies to tasks that we have already largely solved or they have already receded into the past. And we need to draw some conclusions. When Lenin and Stalin worked on the national question, the task was to determine the direction

54

his decision, then the socialist nations were just beginning to take shape as a nation of a new type. And now we really have new nations in the East, and now it is already possible to formulate the signs of a socialist nation and the conditions for its development on the basis of the real experience that we have accumulated.

We already have rich experience. If we count from the end of the civil war, it turns out that for more than thirty years our national border regions have been developing as socialist nations. It is especially important that the most complex Soviet republics did not experience occupation and the process of formation of a socialist nation was not interrupted there. The war mobilized and strengthened, and the evacuation of the intelligentsia from the Center to the republics of Central Asia helped the formation and rise of culture and science. This can be touched upon in the report, but it needs to be thought about. Maybe it will be superfluous. Or maybe it will have to be done not directly, but to talk about the role of the Russian people and emphasize

kick her. Foreign guests, they will also benefit from

listen.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Beria will again and again turn in his notes to this idea, which will find its conclusion in a speech at the congress.

I discussed it with Comrade Stalin and agreed that I would think over the question of our national policy. It is necessary to convincingly, with figures, show that it is possible to live in a multinational state in harmony and support each other. This is important as an example for our foreign comrades.

In what way should you say:

First, a correct national policy is possible only in a socialist state.

Secondly, it is necessary to bring the backward national border regions up to the level of the Center and spare no expense for this.

Thirdly, it must somehow be noted that when all nations are at the same level, it is also easier for the Center, and the big task of the national republics is to quickly catch up to the center. It's in the general interest. You need to get all the data right.

It's the same with people's democracies. If they work well for themselves, it will be easier for us. But if they work for us, it will be easier for us, and ultimately for them. We are not imperialists and we will not take too much off, and we will honestly pay ourselves. But you also work conscientiously, mutually help us too.

But this must be done carefully, Comrade Stalin and I discussed this issue, and he separately warned that we must be careful here.

Think over and give your suggestions, then we will discuss. It is necessary to choose from the works of Comrade Lenin and Comrade Stalin.

In parallel, give the latest materials on the situation in the imperialist bloc with figures.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

The last phrase in the above entry, like the entire entry as a whole, has the form of a detailed instruction by L.P. Beria to his assistants in the preparation of the report. This is the only record of its kind, however, it suggests that Beria, in preparing the report, used the help of a trusted apparatus only to hone and polish some ideas. He gave a thesis plan,

materials were prepared for him, then he worked with them, and so on several times.

As a result, the final text of Beria's report at the congress was well structured, clearly by Beria himself. The specific illustrative material of the report was thought out and selected, as I understand it, also by Beria himself from what he received from his assistants.

Judging by the record, Beria discussed draft versions of the report with assistants, and he discussed, and did not use, their texts. After all, it is one thing to put a signature under someone else's text written not by you, and quite another to write your own text after discussing issues with your employees.

It is necessary to structure the report in such a way that a majestic picture of what has already been achieved is obtained. We ourselves do not understand how much we did in just seven years after the war, before the war, of course, the war was also a great thing, but this is a war, it was a matter of life and death.

But in seven years we have raised the country from the ruins. There was a famine in 1946, and now Mikoyan will talk about plans for the production of delicacies, and we will do it, and we will freely sell, and not the bourgeoisie, but the working people will buy.

Seven years ago there were ruins and famine, but now we are talking seriously about building communism. In principle, I will not talk about the shortcomings in the report, I want to talk about the good and the great. We must try brighter to get it, and not just like that, to report. This congress will be a great thing, people from all over the world will gather, we will talk to ourselves about the shortcomings, but here we need to give a broad picture and so that we ourselves understand what we are doing and how we work, and other people should also think that socialism and the people without exploiters can commit.

As the reader will see for himself in his own place, Beria really embodied this idea of his in the text of the report. In Beria's report, there is, in fact, not a single critical note, but this is not varnishing, not state-of-the-art hypocrisy, but an energetic, self-aware summing up of what has been done. At the same time, this is an analysis from the standpoint of development and an even more creative future. Beria's report is also an emotional one - without pathos, but with a naturally cheerful, optimistic intonation - a call to work for the benefit of a happy life for peoples.

The question of a socialist nation has been correctly raised, I can see it from the way people from the republics approached me and thanked me and asked me to develop this matter. Comrade Stalin said that there was a time when my pamphlet (as in the text. — S.K.) on the history of Bolshevism in Transcaucasia played a positive role, and now, on the basis of the theses of the report, we need to write a book about a socialist nation, and from there we will later let's take something to the new edition of the Program.

A big task, but it must be done. It is necessary to select material well based on facts, but it is necessary to provide a solid foundation based on thoughts. Here it will be possible to give an example of Georgia, to describe how we worked, where we made mistakes and how we found promising forms of work.

Even then, we did not work with general phrases, but collected a separate Republican Plenum on tangerines, thoroughly prepared, asked agronomists, breeders to prepare, prepared specific recommendations on varieties, on agricultural technology, proved by economic calculation that it was profitable. People were specifically convinced that this thing can be

to promote for their own benefit, but it turned out to be a benefit for the entire Soviet Union.

This is how a new socialist nation is being formed, on a new socialist cause, and so that they definitely think not only about their republic, but also for the entire Union. This is where friendship comes into play and connections are being made.

Without a well-developed economy, a new socialist nation will not work. But the second most important thing is the upbringing of new generations and education. Here, too, you can bring Georgia. We have changed everything here in less than 10 years.

We started by sending young people to Moscow and Leningrad, and before I left for Moscow, Vekua (an outstanding Soviet mathematician. - S.K.) was already lecturing at our university. How many institutes have been opened in Tbilisi, even the Institute of Physical Education.

Learn &

We are talking about unity, but unity is not just standing next to each other, but we must think in one direction, similar. It turned out well with Bulganin, they didn't agree, but they said, according to the military preparations of America, it seems that they practically supplemented one another. This is what unity is when we look at the same thing in the same way. The words are different, but the meaning is the same, so let them think that we have unity or not.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

What L.P. Beria in his speech at the Twentieth Congress about various kinds of "Morgans, Rockefellers, Mellons, du Ponts and others", the reader will be able to read further for himself, but for

comparisons and illustrations, I will quote from the report at the congress of the Minister of War N.A. Bulganin:

"Under the cover of false speeches about its peacefulness, the American government is organizing on a large scale the construction of military bases outside its country, mainly in West Germany, France, England, French Morocco, Turkey and Japan. America also creates its naval bases mainly on foreign territories, primarily on those seas that are part of the borders of the North Atlantic bloc. It is not difficult to guess that the construction of all these military bases by the United States of America is carried out

in such a way as to surround the Soviet Union with them and thereby create favorable conditions for themselves in the event of a WAR ... "

Beria and Bulganin really talked about the same thing, but in different terms and in such a way that one speech complemented the other. However, Beria's scope of the problem was wider.

\$ + No.

After the congress there will be especially much work in all directions. Comrade Stalin rightly denounces criticism and self-criticism, but it is also right when they say that you cannot wash a black dog white. You can't break through our bureaucrats with any speeches. What kind of bloodletting they were given in 1937 and 1938, but they remained just like dunduks and self-seekers. The spouse picked up the same hoarders as themselves, but you can't squeeze everyone. Then, earlier, there were many political oppositionists in the leadership with good experience in organizing and underground work. It was dangerous to simply remove them, they

60

they would immediately start conspiracies already angrier, without looking back. It was also impossible to send them to the camps, there was then a massive layer of political enemies, kulaks, sub-kulakists and various former ones. Give them two or three hundred experienced political organizers in each camp, and they could arrange the devil knows what. And the war was already on the nose. So then we decided correctly, the fifth column had to be cut under the root so that there would be no trace left. And then during the war it turned out that not everyone was hooked. Of course, then Yezhov let a lot of innocents under the monastery, but I fixed it, here my conscience is calm.

And now there are already no obvious political opposition in large numbers, the bureaucrat is now not ideological, but selfish, he thinks only of himself.

\$\$ +

Well, I said about the Russian people, it was noted and I was told a lot that I was very correct.

The Russian people are indeed an amazing people, they just need to be properly led. But the Russian people must be educated more than even other peoples.

We in the Caucasus have non-peoples, and you can't call it a nationality, but it's like a great nation. Here you need to educate in the other direction, you are proud of your nationality, but what are you without Russians and without other Soviet peoples. You will be dark and you will be weak, nothing else.

And the Russian people must be educated on the contrary, so that they can be proud of themselves, so that they can say that we, Russians, hold the whole world on the backbone, so give us what is supposed to be. If the Russian people get what they are supposed to, this is exactly what they need for prosperity.

61

But the Russian people and the Russian official are two different things.

If a simple Russian person arrives in a foreign place, he will quickly settle down there and master the language, because what would it be like without a language.

And a Russian official, even a party official, may be without a language, he believes that everyone should know Russian, especially from the apparatus. And if a person is intelligent, he can be nominated, but he knows Russian poorly or does not know at all yet, so why not nominate him?

It is necessary to put forward, but how will you know what opportunities he has, what kind of future leader he is and how he will work with people if you only speak with him through an interpreter, but you cannot talk heart to heart.

Now national politics is even more important than before. Previously, when all peoples were poorer, there was more unity, because trouble brings people together. Now fat has already begun, they live better in the Soviet republics, someone will now look to the side, they say, now we can do it ourselves, without Russians.

This must be stopped, but here it is necessary not with repressions, but with a correct national policy, especially in selecting and cultivating strong personnel.

++\*

The Russian people also have a lot of bad things, and this, too, must be said, as Lenin said, not to humiliate, but to correct. Lenin said that a Russian person is a poor worker compared to the Germans, and he spoke correctly. But then he said that it did not matter, that the Russian people had everything to become an excellent worker. So get it

elk. The Soviet Power brought up a new Russian man, and he led all the rest with him.

When there was a war, the Germans were surprised how smart the Russian workers worked in the occupation, there are such trophy documents, and intelligence delivered them. On the one hand, it's bad that someone also worked hard for the enemy, but on the other hand, it was the Soviet Power that gave them such an education that the Germans did not believe that these were ordinary workers, they thought they were engineers, they only hide .

With smart Power, the Russian people perform miracles and quickly become smart and strong and lead others.

Here it is necessary to think and to offer a place in the Program according to the special significance of the Russian people. But for other peoples not as an insult and humiliation, but as an explanation, as the slogan "Together with the Russian people, forward to a common happy life!".

+ f

Now, after the congress, we must seriously think hard about the content of the new version of the Program. How to turn things around, give more theory, or set specific tasks and say that as communist construction develops, the Party is ready to refine its Program and develop an even newer version, because Marxism is an eternally living and developing science.

## REFLECTIONS ON SOCIALISM AND THE NEW PROGRAM OF THE CPSU

From the compiler and commentator:

As is known, at the 19th Congress of the CPSU(b)-CPSU L.P. Beria was included in the Commission for the revision of the party program. And this was, of course, not accidental - Stalin always knew what did you do.

Beria has always had an interest in conceptual issues - since the time of his work in the Transcaucasus, from the very time when, on the initiative of the First Secretary of the Transcaucasian Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Georgia, L.P. Beria, work was carried out to prepare the book "On the Question of the History of Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia". Beria, no doubt, had a direct and considerable relation to this work, both as an author and as an editor. In fact, it was only after the appearance of this book that a correct view of the role and significance of the work of the young Stalin in the Caucasus was established. And this was important not only for history, but also for living political work throughout the Soviet Union. Therefore, the appeal to the conceptual issues of the current and future state and social life of the USSR was for the late Beria by no means unexpected.

And the fact that Stalin turned on L.P. Beria as a member of the most important ideological commission of the Central Committee, proves that Stalin saw in Beria the potential not only of an outstanding practitioner of socialist construction, but also the potential of an original theorist.

Well, actually! Let's look at the composition of the Commission formed under the chairmanship of I.V. Stalin.

The members of the Commission were: L.P. Beria, L.M. Kaganovich, O.V. Kuusinen, G.M. Malenkov, V.M. Molotov, P.N. Pospelov, A.M. Rumyantsev, M.Z. Saburov, D.I. Chesnokov and P.F. Yudin.

Who was who here?

Lazar Mikhailovich Kaganovich, Georgy Maksimilianovich Malenkov and Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, like Beria himself, were part of Stalin's immediate, everyday political environment for some two, some three decades.

Otto Vilhelmovich Kuusinen (1881-1964), the future ideological "gray eminence" of Khrushchev and academician of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1958), the failed head of "red" Finland, elected at the 19th Congress of the CPSU as a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, had a European liberal education. He graduated in 1905 from the Faculty of History and Philology of the Helsingfors (Helsinki) University. Whatever one may say - theorist!

Maxim Zakharovich Saburov (1900-1977), in 1952 - Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR, although he graduated from the Bauman Higher Technical School (at that time it was called the Moscow Mechanical Engineering Institute) in 1933, and then worked in industry, he began nevertheless in 1921 as a Komsomol worker, from 1923 to 1926 he studied at the Communist University. Ya.M. Sverdlov. Then he was a propagandist for the pro-propaganda group of the Central Committee (later it was called "lecturer of the Central Committee"). At the XX Congress of the CPSU, Saburov was elected a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Pyotr Nikolaevich Pospelov (1898-1979), an academician since 1953, a future major Khrushchevite, was already a professional ideologist during Stalin's time, he was educated at the economic department of the Institute of Red Professors (quite, by the way, infected at one time with Trotskyism). He took part in the preparation of Stalin's "Short Course of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks", in 1940-1949 he was the editor-in-chief of Pravda, at one time he edited the chief

the theoretical organ of the Central Committee, the journal Kommunist, since 1949 became the director of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute.

Alexey Matveyevich Rumyantsev (1905-?, after 1985), an academician economist, who was born in a village in Kostroma, graduated from the Kharkov Institute of National Economy in 1926, and from 1930 worked in Komsomol and party bodies. From 1950 to 1952, he headed the Institute of Economics and the Department of Social Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR ac 1952 - the department of science of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

The 37th volume of the Second Edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, published in 1955, mentions five Rumyantsevs: a Soviet histologist, a Soviet clown (the then famous "Pencil"), Field Marshal Pyotr Rumyantsev and his two diplomat sons, Nikolai and Sergey. The Soviet economist Rumyantsev is not there, which in itself speaks of Khrushchev's disgrace. However, in the Khrushchev era, Rumyantsev adapted, and in the Brezhnev years of 1968-1971 he was even the director of the Institute for Concrete Social Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The peasant son, who became a doctor of philosophical sciences at the age of thirty, Dmitry Ivanovich Chesnokov (1910-1973) was also a professional ideological worker, since 1947 he worked in the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks. Since 1949, he became the editor-in-chief of the journal Questions of Philosophy, and in 1952 he was appointed editor-in-chief of the journal Kommunist. At the 20th Congress he was elected a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU and was one of those young party theorists who were personally promoted and supported by Stalin.

Almost immediately after the death of Stalin, Chesnokov began to be pushed more and more, in 1955 he was generally sent to Gorky - just the head of a department (!) of the regional committee. From 1959, Chesnokov headed a department at Moscow State University; in 1967-1970, when Stalin's political rehabilitation was supposed, he was Vice-Rector of the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU.

The last member of the Commission on the list, another peasant son, Pavel Fedorovich Yudin (1899-1968) was a well-known philosopher and academician in the USSR under Stalin (1953).

From 1917, Yudin worked as a turner, fought in the civil war, and in the 1920s was engaged in editorial work. Yudin received his education at the Institute of Red Professors, of which he was director from 1932 to 1938, then becoming director of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences (he was until 1944). Since 1946, he was the editor-in-chief of the Soviet Book magazine. At the 19th Congress, Yudin was elected a candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, but after the death of Stalin, already in 1953, he was sent as an ambassador to the PRC, recalling him from there in 1959.

As we can see, the purely professional level of the "theoretical", so to speak, part of the Commission for the revision of the CPSU Program was quite high and representative, there were enough professional ideologists. By the way, I note that of all the members of the Stalinist Commission for the revision of the Program of the CPSU, only two came to the Khrushchev court - Pospelov and Kuusinen, which is not surprising.

Pospelov, who to this day is considered by some to be a "convinced Stalinist," was, it seems, a hidden Trotskyist, and an opportunist, for sure. It was Pospelov who led the work on Khrushchev's provocative and false report "On the Cult of Personality."

The figure of Kuusinen is even more mysterious. Without developing this topic here, I will only say that I consider him one of the first, since Lenin's time, the "mole" of World Capital in the leadership of the USSR.

But such colleagues of Beria in the proposed joint work on the new Program of the CPSU, as Rumyantsev, Chesnokov, Yudin, were more or less benign and capable theoretical workers of the Central Committee, professionally well, I repeat, prepared manufactured.

Why did Stalin need Beria in this Commission? Of course, Beria, like the members of the Commission Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, was a member of Stalin's closest "team". And one could assume that Stalin included Lavrenty Pavlovich in the responsible Commission "for the company", if ...

If not for a number of quite obvious considerations that refute this version.

67

Firstly, Stalin did not have "wedding generals" in any sphere of public life.

Secondly, Molotov and Kaganovich (especially Molotov) by the end of 1952 more and more dropped out of active state activity at the highest level and therefore could well concentrate on work in the Commission without prejudice to their other duties. At the same time, Molotov, as already mentioned, was a very strong Marxist social scientist and theorist. Did not swim in matters of theory and Kaganovich.

But Beria was already loaded, as they say, "To the eyeballs", and he was not used to doing something for show, anyhow, and did not know how. Stalin knew this, and if he attracted Beria to, as a matter of fact, important theoretical work, it means that Stalin had well-founded reasons for this. It appeared that Stalin needed Beria in this Commission, in addition to "pure" ideologists and theoreticians.

As for Malenkov, he was present on the Staff Commission, so to speak, as one of the secretaries of the Central Committee. At the same time, Malenkov was the only secretary in the Commission, except for Stalin.

Central Committee, but this is so - by the way.

And, by the way, maybe not by the way, maybe behind this small fact there were major potential changes ... The secretariat of the Central Committee then included Aristov, Brezhnev, Ignatov, Malenkov, Mikhailov, Pegov, Ponomarenko, Stalin, Suslov and Khrushchev . And the absence of almost all the secretaries of the Central Committee, and especially Suslov and Khrushchev, in the Commission, designed to give the party and the country a new, in fact, Program of the CPSU, cannot but be evident today!

Just as the presence of the non-ideologist Beria in this Stalinist Commission cannot but lead to serious reflections today.

Lavrenty Pavlovich's now published notes show that Stalin included him in the company of "notebook" ideologists not in vain. Beria, as we see, had his own, not borrowed, view on the problems of peace and socialism, on the future of mankind and on the difficulties that it could face in the future.

The style of these notes by Beria is also interesting... A person who is forced to deal with many things at once often develops several styles - one for business papers, another for personal papers, and for personal papers the style can be different - one thing is a diary, another is personal. letter, and the third - personal reflections, but recorded as a kind of preparatory material for a serious public speech ...

The style of the entries below I would define as mixed. They, apparently, are rough sketches of what later became the basis of the speech at the congress, but at the same time they are wider - when a person writes, being carried away, he no longer thinks that he will go into action. , and what is written "for the soul", and Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria was, although highly organized, but still an addicted - in the good sense of the word - a person and lived with passions - also in the good sense of this concept.

I would also like to draw the reader's attention to the fact that Beria's thought is always concrete - even when it concerns theoretical, conceptual issues. On the one hand, the habit of clearly formulating - both for others and for oneself - any product of human thinking, from orders to philosophical reflections, clearly affected here. On the other hand, Beria clearly understood that everything related to the human world as a social phenomenon should be clearly defined, without supposedly scientific existentialist and similar tricks.

Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria was an integral nature, and integral natures are not only not inclined, but generally incapable of equivocation and intellectual transfusion from empty to empty.

And it is right.

+%

We wrote down that we needed to develop a new edition of the Party Program. Why a new edition and not a new Program? We argued a lot. This is how I understand Comrade Stalin said more

before the congress. A new program is when the old one is fully implemented, all its goals and objectives are solved, then a new one is possible.

The First Program of the Party was the Program of the struggle for political proletarian power, and the Second Program is already a struggle for the practical construction of socialism, and it also speaks of world communism. So it cannot be considered that the Second Program is completely fulfilled, but there is a lot of things that have long been fulfilled and have lost their significance.

Help from Sergei Kremlev:



The first program of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) was adopted at | Congress of the RSDLP.

The congress first met in Brussels on July 17 (30), 1903, and then, due to police persecution, moved its work to London, where its work ended on August 10 (23), 1903.

The first program included as an immediate political task "the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a democratic republic" with a strong socially oriented constitution. However, this was, in fact, a minimum program that did not go beyond the bourgeois-democratic framework.

But at the insistence of Lenin, the same program also contained a maximum program, which actually fit into a couple of phrases, which said that the replacement of capitalist production relations with socialist ones, that is, a social revolution, "is the ultimate goal all activities of international social democracy" and that "the necessary condition for this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to crush all resistance of the exploiters.

70

At the same congress, the RSDLP split into the revolutionary part of the party, the Bolsheviks, and the opportunist part, the Mensheviks (the names come from the results of voting on a number of fundamental issues, where the Leninist point of view won). At a meeting of 22 Bolsheviks in Geneva in August 1904, the "Bureau of Committees of the Majority" was elected, and from that moment on, the Bolsheviks acted as a de facto separate party, although cooperating to the extent possible with the rest of the fractions of the RSDLP.

At the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP (b) a resolution was adopted on the need to revise the party program within two months, but revolutionary practice overshadowed the revolutionary theory and outlines of the revision of the program on October 25 (November 7), 1917, became outdated - without ensuring implementation the minimum program, the Bolsheviks fulfilled the maximum program and carried out the socialist revolution.

At the VI Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) held in Moscow from 18 to 23 March 1919 [RSDLP(b) was renamed the RCP(b) at the VI Congress held on March 6–8, 1918 in Petrograd] was the second overall and the first socialist program of the party was adopted, worked out by a commission formed by the MP congress.

I carefully read the old Program and it is clear that little will remain of the old text in the new edition. But what remains is the main thing, it cannot be considered that we have done it, it still needs to be done.

Therefore, we need to create a practically new Program in terms of content, but consider that this is not a new program, but a new edition of our old Program of struggle for world communism in new historical conditions.

Others also think so, especially Molotov and Kaganovich. Comrade Stalin listened and said that

71

we have proved our political maturity, because indeed, if we simply replace the old program with a new one, it will be like a statement that we have fulfilled the old one. But we have not fulfilled it even in the part of the 6-hour working day, and there is no talk of a communist revolution that will lead humanity out of the impasse. Today, the meaning of the slogan "communist revolution" is changing, it is difficult to count on practically a communist revolution in

America and the imperialist bloc, and this also needs to be explained, but consider that this is a new version of the old Program, and not a new Program.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

For a modern person, all these details and disputes in the Stalinist "team" as to whether to consider the new main party document as a new program or a new version of the program may seem like scholastic trifles.

Well, what, if you think about it, is the difference? After all, even a superficial acquaintance with the Program of the RCP(b), adopted at the International Congress, convinces that the Commission of the 19th Congress, in any case and with any approach, had not to rework the old program, namely, to develop a new program, into which from the old only certain positions could pass.

The 1919 program dealt with many such current tasks that had simply disappeared by 1952 (for example, in the military, in the field of money and banking, and in the economic field as well). And yet, Stalin and his "team", including Beria, were right.

The program is a kind of manifesto, a symbol of faith, a dream. And the rejection of a dream or even the replacement of a major dream, a major goal by another dream, another goal is fraught with very bad things in the future.

The Second Program noted: "Only a proletarian, communist revolution can lead  
human

72

out of the impasse created by imperialism and imperialist wars. Whatever the difficulties of the revolution and its possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

Could Stalin and his ideologists - if they were Marxists and Bolsheviks - consider that this most important ideological and theoretical provision of the old Program was outdated or fulfilled? Of course not! They were seasoned political fighters who rose to the pinnacle of power in the greatest power in an unprecedented political struggle, the success of which was ultimately determined by the level of support of the masses. And the level of support of the masses and the level of their trust in the leaders were ultimately determined by the ideological steadfastness, consistency and clarity of the political thinking of the leaders.

In the first Program of the RSDLP in 1903, the thesis about the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to crush all resistance of the exploiters. And this main requirement of the first Program was fulfilled in November 1917. Therefore, a need arose for a new program.

But the main requirement of the second program, the program of 1919, was not fulfilled in 1952 - humanity was still threatened with the impasse of world capitalism. And therefore it was necessary to speak not about the new program of the Party. so the new edition is still not fully completed the old program.

Looking ahead, I note that for Khrushchev's "ideologists" such subtleties did not exist. They "boldly" "developed" the Third Program of the CPSU and adopted it for XXI Congress of the CPSU, setting the date for building a communist society in 1980.

As for the demand for a 6-hour working day, Comrade Stalin made a correct remark. He carried this idea through in The Economic Problems of Socialism, only this time clearly and in connection with the need  
polytechnic

73

education, so that a person would not be tied to one profession all his life and, if he wanted, could change it. This is a necessary thing, and it will have to be directly taken into the new version of the Program, but in the form in which Comrade Stalin outlines it, with a transition to a 5-hour working day in the future.

Comrade Stalin has worked very hard on this work of his, and it will have to be re-read more than once, there is a lot to take directly into the new edition. But here we need to think a lot, because we do not have a sensible political economy of socialism, here Comrade Stalin is right to worry.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

In my introductory essay on the 19th Congress of the CPSU, I cited that passage from Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism" which spoke of the task of "reducing the working day to at least 6, and then to 5 hours" in order "to give members of society enough free time to get a comprehensive education".

For comparison, I will cite a similar passage from the program of 1919, from the section "In the field of labor protection and social security":

"... In addition, the RCP should set itself the task of establishing:

1) in the future, with a general increase in labor productivity, a maximum 6-hour working day without a decrease in remuneration for labor and with the obligation of workers, in addition, to devote two hours, without special remuneration, to the theory of craft and production, to practical training in technology public administration and military art ... "

Thirty-three years later, Stalin expanded the essence of this task and declared that the reduction of the working day should become a condition for the all-round development of man and his polytechnic education!

74

w w \*

Comrade Stalin now often repeats: "Without theory, we die." Very correct. That is why a new Program must be developed, and thought ten times, and measured ten times and rechecked again. There is a lot of obscurity here, but we need to figure out what we have built and what needs to be built.

Someone thinks that we have already surpassed everyone, defeated everyone, and now forward to the bright future of communism. Communism is possible, but we still have to work and work. And think and think even more, Comrade Stalin says the same thing.

There was an interesting conversation a few years ago. People from Hungary arrived, and in the course of conversations someone told Comrade Stalin that the Soviet experience in building socialist democracy is very important for the People's Democracies. And Comrade Stalin only shrugged his shoulders and said that we have to go and go to socialist democracy, we did not have the conditions for its formation. If we had begun to breed democracy, we would have been long gone, the Soviet power would have perished long ago.

This is true. As long as we have not achieved a better life for us than in the main capitalist countries for their middle class, or at least the same, so that everyone has good housing, so that there is food, clothes, shoes, all sorts of refrigerators, until then there will always be the danger of capitalist restoration. You can't explain to everyone that not all of us can do it right away. Five years after the war, we immediately promoted two powerful new industries, nuclear and missile, but the people still do not know about it, only guesses.

But guessing is one thing, but you need to know for sure. Then you will understand better. This also needs to be explained.

75

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

In the appendix to the fourth volume of L.P. Beria was given extracts from the draft version of the "Collection on the history of mastering atomic energy in the USSR." The collection was prepared in 1952-1953 at the direction of L.P. Beria and under his editorship by the secretariat of the Special Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR with the participation of experts from the nuclear industry.

Beria (obviously with Stalin's approval) intended to reveal the general scale of nuclear work in the USSR, and such a step would help the broad masses of Soviet society realize that many of the difficulties of the post-war period were explained precisely by the need to divert huge funds from the national economy for defense.

When people understand where the money goes and how the government works, they work better themselves. Comrade Stalin said well about the cogs. A small screw has fallen out of the car, and there may be an accident. We do not have little people that the Soviet system does not need. With us, everyone is like a cog in a machine, everyone is needed, and everyone is in business, and everyone has his own function in the common work.

When life is settled, everyone wants to have a good rest, to be near the water, to be with the family. This is all we need, and we need to go towards this. A person must work, otherwise he is not a person. But a person has the right to rest. Leaders are another matter. How can one relax here when there are 100 hours a day, and there are only 24 hours of them. But leaders should also rest, our health is also state property. Comrade Stalin correctly says that our work is the work of the peasants, like that of an ox. 'You pull and pull, you can't, but you still pull. But in order to prepare a real socialist leadership

76

As a teacher, it takes at least five or six years even for talent.

Take my example. I was immediately raised, back in Baku, but then it was such a time. There were no people, if you worked and showed your abilities, then they raised you. Just work. They grew up early then. But anyway, if I had been given the Caucasus at the age of 25, I might have failed.

Help from Sergei Kremlev:

L.P. Beria joined the leadership of the Azerbaijan Cheka at the age of twenty-two and then until the early 1930s he worked in the bodies of the Cheka-OGPU. At twenty-eight, he became People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the Georgian SSR, and at thirty-two he was transferred to party work - first, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Georgia. At the age of thirty-three, from October 1932, Beria headed the party organization of Transcaucasia. That is, his career growth was fast, but still gradual, from step to step. At the same time, he became the sole commander just six years later.

years.

Desire is desire, but you can't pull it out without experience. You need at least five years of gradual leadership work, and then if you have a head on your shoulders, you can do great things. But you still need to constantly learn, both from books and from people. If people see that you want to study and know well, this will not lower your authority. On the contrary, people will always go to a meeting and tell you everything they need and tell you if they see what you really need.

Again my example. When I started working on Atomic Works, what I knew then was nothing. He knew what an electron was, but what a positron was, he didn't even know where he came from. It wasn't the hardest part yet.

77

here I didn't have to figure it out much, because this is the business of scientists, but still I learned something, I learned, because I was not afraid to ask, and the teachers were smart, all academicians and professors. But there were a lot of technical and technological issues that if you don't figure out how to lead. And figured it out.

This is how we need to understand our social system. What have we built? What we want to build, we know, we want to build communism. And what is the main thing in communism? Material abundance? What does abundance mean? Here you can see it from different angles.

Sufficiency must be provided to all. This means that everyone has a separate apartment, there are enough communal apartments, people are crowded not because of a good life. We will do this in 10 years, we will do a lot in 15 if we work well.

The food is good, so that everything you need for life, vitamins and so on, is in abundance in the products. This is also an achievable task. Anastas Ivanovich also promises us in 10 years such mass gastronomy that millionaires will envy.

Clothes, shoes, here we will also soon step up and straighten out, there are reserves, now we can spend less on nuclear work, and reorient ourselves to light industry.

Refrigerators, TVs, it will all be there too.

What does it mean that we have built communism in its main features even in a capitalist environment? Then now we are no longer alone, there is a camp of socialism, and it will be strengthened, so that even there we need to think about communism after some time and pull everyone up to a high level.

Okay, pulled up. What does this mean, now we will no longer have a world socialist camp, but a world communist camp?

78

w w +

We said that we had already built socialism and were starting to build communism. For the people it is like a beacon, we must see the future. But so far we have a lot of gaps. There is no need to talk about them much in the Program, they say, they don't exist, they don't exist. What we do not have is the people, and without our speeches they know better than us. It is necessary to talk about the shortcomings in the work and point out them in order to correct and eliminate them. There will be no flaws, there will be no gaps.

But why are there disadvantages? We say birthmarks of capitalism. And if the director is 35 years old for water, and the Soviet government is also 35 years old, and he has the birthmarks of capitalism, then where does this come from? From parents? And his parents are workers, not a bar. They worked honestly and could not set a bad example for their son. Where did he get it from? Is this an objective reality or is it from a lack of education?

Comrade Stalin writes that objective laws also operate in a socialist society and you cannot jump over them and simply cannot change them with a directive. Not everything is clear here. We are not dictated by capital, and the market does not dictate prices to us. There are no crises either. It turns out that if you have taken into account all the reserves and planned everything correctly, then you can do it the way you want. And Comrade Stalin writes that you can do it only in accordance with the current economic law, and if you do not know it, then it will hit you painfully and your plans are worthless, you will fail.

I told Comrade Stalin, how did we work before that? If we still do not know the economic laws of the society we are building, then how could we build it.

79

And Comrade Stalin laughs and asks: "Did we build it? We have built it in our reports and tell people that we have built it. And we say it right, because we need to indicate the light ahead, like a beacon. The lighthouse also does not illuminate all night, but it gives the correct course, and so do our speeches. But we ourselves must understand that the lighthouse is only a direction. And on the way to the lighthouse there can be a shoal, rocks. It's easy to get lost without a map. So we are without comprehending the economic laws of our society. We used to build without much theory, because we didn't have anything, not even a proper foundation. While the civil war was going on, what kind of theory is there, God forbid at least some kind of economy is preserved.

Then the war ended, left alone alone with capitalism. Red Germany did not work out, if it existed, then it would not be possible to speed up industrialization in such a way, but in this way it was necessary to build an industry in a command way and reverse the individualism of the peasants, to carry out collectivization. Before they had time, the war broke out, again command methods. They sacrificed their lives, tore the navel, what economic methods were there, when I had to threaten the directors of factories not with a ruble, but with execution. What are the economic laws?

Then, after the war, they began to restore the national economy. Women plowed the land on their own, hunger, and here it is necessary to extract funds for Atomic Weapons, it was also not up to economic laws. All the time we worked in a mobilization regime, and not because we wanted to, but life itself forced us to do so. But now it's a different matter, now it's time to figure out how, according to what laws, a normal socialist society should live, in the conditions of a normal life. How to act - raise wages and prices

80

reduce and reduce, or first reduce the cost, and then reduce the price.

We still lived according to the laws of war, we were forced to do so. During the war, thousands of people will be killed, and it is considered normal, no one dress up the investigation. And in peacetime, one person will be killed, and a dozen people, it happens, spend months figuring out who and why and why. And rightly so, because in peacetime it is necessary to live according to the law, but if we live in peacetime not according to the law, then we will not have a normal life, we will fail."

Comrade Stalin said something like this, and when I said that it was not so easy to include it in the Program, but it would be necessary to include it, he said: "It is absolutely necessary, but with what words, I myself am racking my brains, and let's break it. Here we will make a draft of a new edition and launch it for public discussion. Do you think I simply included in the "Economic Problems of Socialism" the materials of the discussion with Venzher (the Soviet economist, whose mistakes Stalin wrote about — S.K.) and others? I wanted to show that although they are wrong, a discussion is needed. It is necessary to think together, the time has come that we will not advance the matter far simply by a meeting and a resolution of the Politburo."

I honestly confessed to Comrade Stalin that I had not yet seriously worked through The Economic Problems of Socialism, but here it is necessary with a pencil more than once. While I'm doing it snatches. But it is already clear that there is a sea of thoughts and even an ocean of thoughts. But I will get involved in the work and I will make notes. Moreover, I have a lot of sensible heads, I am now starting to attract them, let them think too. This is a common task and a common interest. The more we think, the easier it will be later.

81

Comrade Stalin chuckled and said, what is the sea-ocean for? He wanted to give us a source of thought, and if the source leads the right way, then the result is a great river, and it leads to the sea and ocean.

As he always can accurately say, and there is nothing to add.

How many years have we been with him, but still, when it comes to deep thoughts, I feel like a student in front of a teacher.

It seems that the student has grown, but still the teacher looks wiser, what can I say.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Stalin's last major theoretical work, Economic Problems of Socialism, was published almost on the eve of the 19th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, but, as I guess, there was no very deep meaning in this (in the sense - in the timing of publication) was not.

It's just that Stalin, at least in rough outline, completed work on this brilliant work of his - without exaggeration - just on the eve of the congress. And since the work was completed, and Stalin was not of youthful age, he, of course, wanted to make his last work a public fact as soon as possible.

Stalin did just that...

At the same time, in his last work, Stalin, as before, looked further than others and thought deeper than others. That is why he saw future possible theoretical errors and practical failures arising from them. And that is why Stalin was so worried about the actual absence of a theoretical basis for the economic development of socialism.

With ideological and cultural development, everything was more or less clear, here the development process had to be based on the principles of high, active humanism and the education of mass high morality.

As for the economic side of the matter, even Stalin saw it as if in a fog, and he strove to

to carry this anxiety to the country, giving it rich material for discussion in the form of his "Economic problems ...".

As you can see, Beria was imbued with Stalin's anxiety, but less than six months after the publication of Economic Problems in Pravda, their author was killed, and less than four months after that, Beria was also killed. And the problems stated in Stalin's last work were quickly curtailed by the Khrushchevites.

One has to make sure that theoretical work is constantly needed for a political leader, otherwise if one does not engage in theory, the brains dry up in this direction, and this is bad. It's like walking in an unfamiliar place without a map.

I haven't seriously studied theory for almost 20 years, then it wasn't up to it, but now I'm doing it again and I see that my head is working hard, which is bad. All the time you are engaged in practical questions on the national economy, but this is not enough, now I see it myself. The fact that Comrade Stalin involved me in theoretical work has already turned out to be useful, because you start thinking about theory as soon as you climb up the mountain and look far from the pass. And you look far away, you see a lot that you can't see from below.

We are not American capitalists, there are Morgans or Rockefellers (as in the text. - S.K.), but the leaders of the masses who are building a new society, an unprecedented society. This means that we need to understand not only practical issues, but also not to forget about the social sciences, because we need to see a political task behind a practical task and show others that we are not just building a factory or planning a new dam, but we are doing it for so that people can develop and develop their society and go forward and upward.

I took the works of Comrade Lenin to refresh them, then I took Engels and read them out, even though there was no time. Here we will solve a couple of important practical issues, and it will be necessary to transfer much of case No. 1, 2 and 3 to those who are younger, and to put more pressure on the theory and draft of the new edition of the Program. Very interesting and clears the mind. Then the practical work will be better to go, one to another will help.

Sergey Kremlen's comment:

By case No. 1, 2 of iz, Beria, no doubt, means his duties on the Special Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, that is, overseeing the nuclear industry (including the extraction and processing of uranium raw materials) and the rocket industry. And when he talks about solving "a couple of important practical issues," then at least one can be assumed with a high degree of probability that he means preparations for testing the first Soviet hydrogen bomb RDS-bs, which was developed under Beria and tested after his assassination in August 1953

of the year.

The Bolsheviks took power more than 40 years ago. A person at the age of 40 is the heyday, he has a lot of strength, he has experience, live and work. But for different people, 40 years is a different age. If you were born in a poor family, ate poorly, did not receive an education, then you will not get much success even by the age of 40. And if you get them, then at a very heavy price, you have to work hard to achieve something. reach.

And if you were born in a rich, educated family, you were immediately given a good education, you went in for sports from childhood, listened to music, developed culturally, then even without a lot of work you will play a prominent role, you can do a lot if you don't waste your life. .

84

This should also be included in the Program.

Mayakovsky wrote that it is good to live in our bucha, fighting, ebullient. But what we need now is not a storm, but a planned enthusiasm. If I may say so. Enough fighting and boiling, so you can boil away and burn out. Enthusiasm is a great thing, it should not be extinguished, but enthusiasm must also be able to direct in advance and think over the direction of its application.

Right enthusiasm appears and works right when the goal is chosen correctly and the task is set correctly. Otherwise, if you make a fool pray to God, he will hurt his forehead, that's all the enthusiasm.

When at the front he set a combat mission in the right way, you see, the commander himself thinks the same, he has the same plan of his own, his eyes light up, he is eager to carry it out, because it coincides with his understanding of the matter. This is the kind of enthusiasm that moves mountains.

\*hedgehog

We must more carefully select materials on the economies of all countries, separately on imperialist countries, separately on colonial and dependent countries, separately on people's democracies. And one sample. It is necessary to select a special apparatus for this case in order to give him targeted tasks, and he has already applied to the institutes of ministries, departments and the Academy of Sciences. But now everything is scattered, until you find the right person to prepare sensible material, you don't even need a certificate.

The question of Germany must be thought through especially strongly. The matter is very difficult.

All our questions are not simple, but it is especially difficult with the Germans, because there is the fact of two Germans. Molotov always stands only for the revolution and for socialism at any cost, but how can this be done in Germany.

America strongly supports the FRG economically, and it is easier to live there than in East Germany, so compare.

Comrade Stalin is in favor of yielding to us here, and I think that this is correct.



You can't have everything at once, here you need to really weigh your strengths and capabilities. We cannot lose the GDR, but we will not lose it, our troops are there. But you can go for a united, independent, peaceful and democratic Germany, if you are firmly on this idea. We will have a united Germany beneficial.

And in East Germany, the main thing is not to force things. There the bauer is strong, he knows how to work, the laborers are not like ours, so you need to support them with equipment if they want to unite in a collective farm, but no need to press.

Youth movement should not be missed, the Germans love organizing, but our meetings are not suitable for them, they need more sports, invite them to visit us, and not to ceremonial meetings, but to take them on a hike with our students, it is interesting for young people .

And to lead the line - if you want a united Germany, we are all for it. But you demand from America, let him leave, let him give up his property in Germany for nationalization, but for you, for the Germans, not for us. If we see that a united Germany will exist for the Germans, we are ready to agree to a united Germany and we will withdraw our troops.

But first, let America begin. She is far away, the Germans didn't bomb the city and didn't destroy people

sorry. We need strong guarantees, not America. So, for one withdrawn American division, our battalion, or many - a regiment. Let's start and then we'll see.

\*++

Comrade Stalin is deeply worried that we do not have a real sensible political economy of socialism. The political economy of capitalism was well developed by Marx and Engels, and then Comrade Lenin worked[!] and Comrade Stalin also added. And the bourgeois economists worked hard. And on socialism we blundered. But there are objective difficulties here. It is clear with capitalism, the main thing in their economy is profit.

And we have?

Economic problems, that's right. Now these problems are the most important, and they need to be sorted out. Here to read and read, all thoughts to the point.

Therefore ... (this entry ends. - S.K.)

\* #4 \*

Maxim Gorky wrote a good essay about Comrade Lenin. I re-read it recently, it says well that people don't like to be bothered a lot, they don't need big changes. Gorky wrote:

"Everything extraordinary prevents people from living the way they want. People crave—if they crave—not a fundamental change in their social skills, but only an expansion of them. The main groan and cry of the majority: "Do not bother us to live as we used to."

87

Vladimir Lenin was a man who prevented people from living their usual lives in such a way that no one before him knew how to do it.

This is very well written, but about old people. Gorky wrote this in 1924, when there were still very few new people of socialism. Gorky was not a Bolshevik and did not understand one simple thing. Vladimir Ilyich would not have been able to prevent the majority from living the old life if there had not been such a minority in Russia that wanted the same thing as Lenin. Mayakovsky understood this better than Gorky and wrote: "It is enough to live by the law given by Adam and Eve." If

If there weren't such people and such a mass that wanted so much, then the Bolsheviks would not have succeeded.

Gorky wrote that the position of honest leaders of the people is inhumanly difficult. Gorky himself was not a leader, otherwise he would have written that this position is humanly difficult, because the leader of the people has strength when he relies on the people. If the leader is a man, then the people around him are also drawn to live like human beings. Comrade Stalin compares the leaders of the people with Antey. As long as you hold on to the people, you gain strength, but if you break away, that's it, you don't have strength.

The position of honest leaders of the people, of course, is difficult, Comrade Stalin says that this is bullshit work, but on the other hand, you get pleasure when the job is already done and you did it together with people.

When Gorky was writing, there were few new people, but during the years of Soviet power we have brought them up by the millions. Before the war, there were already many millions of such people who aspired to the extraordinary. What songs were written, and these people sang them and lived as they sang in the song. But how many of them died in the War. What people, what shots!

Now new people have grown up again, educated and hot. And they were brought up again by the Soviet Power, the War tempered and educated. They themselves do not want to live in peace, and they will not let others. You can move mountains with such people, and we are moving them. It can be said that as long as such people in the country will massively grow (so in the text. - S.K.), socialism will only grow stronger. And if such people decrease in the country, socialism will also decrease, because socialism is people. There are restless people, there is socialism.

Lenin prevented many people from living the old life, but this is also said about Comrade Stalin, and about all the Bolsheviks. And whoever does not know how, he is not a Bolshevik. Kamenev, Zinoviev, Nikolai Bukharin calmed down themselves, and did not bother others. That's why they went to waste because they rotted inside. And the soul of a Bolshevik inside is always healthy and vigorous, because, like Antey, you take strength from people.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

These reflections of L.P. Beria interpret the problem very deeply and accurately. And here the fundamental difference between the Bolshevik intellectual and the liberal intellectual is clearly revealed. Gorky now and then "staggered" and hesitated. It was no coincidence that during the difficult period of the revolution he came out with his "Untimely Letters". They were really untimely, what is called - "gundels under the arm." Then, when things got better, Gorky became a supporter of socialist construction. But this truly great "engineer of human souls" understood the essence of human nature worse than the Bolshevik Beria.

Gorky believed that there is a certain nature of the human soul, and this nature determines the unwillingness of fundamental changes by the majority. And Beria understood, and understood not speculatively, but as a result of real, practical work

bots with people that a person is what society makes of him. If you want the majority to be active, create social political conditions for this and educate the active masses.

Not by chance, and not just as a sign of the times, but as the fulfillment of the social order of the Bolshevik Party, Stalin's Party, such massively popular lines appeared in the new Russia as: vivacity, praise, hammer and verse, the land of youth! ", "We have no barriers on the sea and on land ... ", "Whoever is used to fighting for victory, let him sing with us: "He who is cheerful, he laughs, whoever wants, then he will achieve, whoever seeks will always find ... ", "For a just cause, you proudly and boldly go, not being afraid of anything ... "

Lavrenty Pavlovich, in fact, prophetically wrote that socialism is people, that if there are restless people in the country, there is socialism. Even in Brezhnev's (and even in Gorbachev's!) times there were enough people who were restless, able and willing to look into the future. I remember how in 1988 I was driving for 24 hours from the still Soviet Crimea to the capital of the USSR, Moscow, with a surprisingly nice and attractive couple. He is a Serb who graduated from the Moscow Engineering and Construction Institute, she is Russian, a native of Yalta. Large, beautiful outwardly and inwardly guys, already over thirty, that is, young in their mature youth, they were driving home, and during the day we talked about a lot, unanimously agreeing that Gorbachev was a bastard. And then the beautiful Mila said: "Yes, if the country called, we would respond!"

Alas, this was the time of no longer honest leaders of the people, but the time of leading agents of influence such as the politburist Yakovlev, leading Jews like Gorbachev and leading cretins like Yegor Ligachev ... New songs were already being prepared for the country: "I am a chocolate hare, I am a silk bastard »  
and so on.

Molotov is always for revolution and says that the main thing for the Bolsheviks is the struggle to overthrow the power of capital. And if this task is not set, then

it is conciliation and revisionism. Everything is correct in theory, but how in practice. Then, the theory is also not always a decree. Comrade Lenin well said that Marxism is not a dead dogma, but a living guide to action.

And what actions do we need now in the main capitalist countries? America profited from the war, the masses there will not go to the revolution. In Europe, life is worse, but America helps a lot there and their capitalists understand that if you don't give the people a good life, the communists can take over. So there is no need to count on a revolution in Europe either. In Germany, this did not work out even immediately after the imperialist war, when the allies of the Germans ripped off like a stick. And now the allies are feeding the Germans, helping to restore the economy, so what kind of revolution can there be in Germany?

Here we need to think differently and orient people differently. Is revolution now a strategy or a tactic? When there was not a single workers' state in the world, the revolution was a strategy for the Bolsheviks, a general line. Everyone worked for it and, when the opportunity arose, they made a revolution. And then Comrade Stalin said that he often discussed with Ilyich that no fool in Russia would go for a socialist revolution if the Provisional Government adopted a correct social policy. They fed everyone breakfast and promised to do everything after the Constituent Assembly. And the country was falling apart, it was getting worse, and people understood this. The soldier was tired of fighting, and he realized that he was fighting for the wrong thing. And he - go to battle. The worker has already tried what he can manage, and he knows his place. They behaved even more foolishly with the peasants. They need land, and they

91

instead, the constituent assembly is poked in the nose. Well, we nailed it.

And in the imperialist states, the masses live materially well on the whole, so how can they be roused to the revolution? If we continue to regard the task of the socialist revolution in the imperialist countries as our strategy, we will not get far. Our strategy should be world socialism, and this is a real task, but here the revolution can now be a tactic,  
where possible.

For the imperialist states, it is necessary to make the strategy not revolution, but evolution, but here, too, one must think.

We can win over the masses of the leading imperialist states to socialism when we live better materially than the masses live in the imperialist states. The masses in them have been brought up in a bourgeois spirit, and this must be taken into account. For the masses of the people under capitalism, questions of spiritual development do not have much influence, they need a piece of bread with

oil. The intelligentsia in the imperialist bloc live well materially, but spiritually they see that capitalism stinks, so the intelligentsia there is more inclined towards socialism. And people are intimidated. How can we fight for socialism?

And so, a good example. We are now fulfilling the fifth five-year plan. If we do it, we will no longer live badly, there will be a strong light industry, and we will strongly advance the food industry. Already an example. Military spending can be reduced, the people's democracies will have more returns, and they will need less help. One by one, and there by 1964 we will finish the sixth five-year plan and by about 1970 we can have that

what a material level that even the American worker would envy.

Comrade Stalin sets the task of moving in the future to a 6-hour, and then to a 5-hour working day. The imperialist bloc will never agree to this, but we will. Also an example.

We will develop culture, physical education, mass sports, travel are also an example. So let's do that they will envy us and say, but give us socialism too. A piece of bread and butter is not enough for us, we also want to play tennis and go to museums and theaters and travel abroad.

So in the imperialist bloc, we need to bet on smart evolution. You can't arrange a revolution there now. The capitalists are not fools either, they are convinced that the USSR is already a good example, and if you do not satisfy your masses, then it may even come to a revolution. Therefore, they will not allow the revolution there.

And the revolutionary strategy must be applied to the national liberation movements in the colonial and dependent countries. There is now great unrest there, England and France have weakened, and in their colonies and dependent countries they live in poverty, in misery, where revolutionary tactics are needed, and they must be put into the mainstream of a general revolutionary strategy.

If a person lives the life of a dog and walks around in rags and with a hungry belly, he is less afraid of losing his life and rises to fight more easily. We need to take this into account. Now we already have China, in India you can joke well, only smartly. There are many places, you just have to act wisely.

If we do not intercept the colonial and dependent countries, America will intercept them. It is the richest country, it will also bribe. And to us, while

poverty in backward countries, it is necessary to press on the idea and on your own example. They say that thirty years ago they slurped bast shoes, and now Hitler was defeated and the Atomic Bomb was made, that's what socialism can do. And you can do the same. Here a spiritual example can do much. And if we miss it, the imperialist bloc will seize the initiative.

It is important to strengthen and strengthen our influence and our ideas in the colonial and dependent countries also in order to weaken and weaken the imperialist bloc. The weaker he is, the stronger we are. Latin America is already reaching out to us, this is a huge reserve. We are locomotives for them, they are meat for us. Everyone is fine.

But the main course of revolution must be taken in the backward countries. And immediately to the socialist, and not to the bourgeois or national liberation. National liberation is not enough for us now, because America and the entire imperialist bloc can take over from us. And we need to show that if you go for socialism, then development will go quickly, like ours, and you will live like people, you will no longer be considered cattle. Just come to us, and we will help with personnel and weapons. There is a large revolutionary reserve here.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

The above is a devilishly sensible line for achieving world socialism in the future. Had it been accepted, the history of the world might have gone differently.

In fact, Khrushchev made the idea of peaceful coexistence actually a factor of historical capitulation to the forces of imperialism and capitalism. Khrushchev idiotically declared to the West: "We will bury you," but by deeds he laid the foundation for the opposite development of events, which would be disastrous for socialism and the USSR in the future.

94

To say about the inadmissibility of freeloaders, but this must be said carefully, in one word. The countries on native democracy and we have many common interests and there is no antagonism, there is no competition. We are not imperialists, they are not colonies.

But the colonies have nowhere to go, there is bondage, you can't just jump out. And inside the European countries of people's democracy there are always forces that are drawn to the Marshall plan (as in the text. - S.K.), it is fatter there. And they say, since we are with the Russians, let them help us, since they do not allow us to take help from America. As they say, an affectionate calf sucks two queens.

It will be necessary to recall that the imperialist bloc will not be an equal partner, that America is not even keeping England on an equal footing and is seizing their markets. And it must be remembered that if you submit to America, then such peoples can always become cannon fodder against the Soviet Union.

It is better to be honest with us, it will be more reliable.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

In the report of L.P. Beria at the 19th Congress, this thesis was not clearly voiced, but traces of it can be noticed upon careful reading.

Even then, there was a tendency of the "countries of people's democracy" to swindle at the expense of the USSR, with a complacent attitude towards this from the Kremlin leaders. And Beria insisted on the exact fulfillment of business contractual obligations, and he already had skirmishes with his colleagues about this - the same Mikoyan, for example.

I think it would be useful to cite the story of Mao Zedong's wife, the beautiful Jiang Ching. In the early 1950s, she was visiting the USSR and wished to visit a department store. She was taken to GUM, where the guest saw a huge queue, how

it turned out to be behind Chinese woolen blouses (by the way, this clearly shows that in the USSR Stalin still had no fashion to throw dust in the eyes of foreigners with ostentatious well-being). As Anastasia Kartunova, an assistant to the Central Committee, later recalled, upon returning to the mansion, Jiang Ching said that she was amazed that the Soviet people, who opened a new era with their revolution and saved the world from fascism, were standing in line "behind our Chinese lousy sweaters," and exclaimed : "Yes, all of us, the countries of people's democracy, must tear off the last thing from ourselves so that the Soviet people do not need anything."

Alas, Jiang Jing's husband thought the opposite, considering the USSR as a cash cow, and not a strategic partner forever.

We have lagged behind the capitalist world. Where we have two factories, there are dozens of firms in the imperialist bloc. And they often help each other, although there is competition. And they won't help us.

And their scientists ... (The entry ends here. - S.K.)

+ learn

Peaceful coexistence is a must, there is nowhere to go. The Atomic Bomb is a fact, they have a lot of them, and the Hydrogen Superbomb is also on the way. They already have atomic bombs in the hundreds

thousand tons of TNT. You won't fight here. The tricky question is that in these words the main thing is what should be emphasized, peaceful or coexistence?

I think the key word here is peace. We cannot go to war, so we need peace. But the course must be taken towards world socialism, otherwise what kind of Bolsheviks are we? This means that we must live together without war, in peace, but we must work to ensure that the masses in

the imperialist bloc gradually saw that socialism is better. Then we live peacefully, and the peaceful life works for us. But the goal is socialism throughout the world.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

As you can see, Beria considered the idea of peaceful coexistence as tactical, and not as general, but not in the sense of the inevitability of a world war between the two world camps, but in the sense of the necessity of a line for the victory of socialism on a world scale by peaceful means.

After the assassination of Stalin and Beria, the principle of peaceful coexistence was elevated by the Khrushchevites, in fact, to the absolute.

And it was ideological capitulation.

In some ways, Beria anticipated the ideas of convergence, but he thought like a true Marxist. In his view, not capitalism and socialism should have been mutually and peacefully approaching, but world capitalism should have gradually evolved into socialism by convincingly demonstrating to the masses of the capitalist camps the all-round advantages of socialism.

Moreover, this rapprochement had to be ensured by the increasingly socialist orientation of almost the entire third world.

A world socialist bloc is already taking shape in our country. This is correct, and it must be developed. But there is a danger here. Comrade Lenin wrote in the sense that we have conquered Russia, we have convinced Russia, now we must govern Russia. And in the countries of people's democracy, we gave them socialism as if on a plate. In European countries they shed some blood for socialism, even in Yugoslavia. And what is easily acquired is not very appreciated. They might say you gave us

politically

97

socialism, now let's economically, help. This is how dependent moods can arise. A lot of political work is needed here, to say that we, comrades, have greatly facilitated your task. During the war, the authority of the communists has grown, now develop and strengthen it, work with people. It's easier for you, you didn't have such devastation, and there won't be a civil war, here we guarantee you. And in economic terms, work more yourself, we have no extra funds.

Here, China and Korea are stronger. There they fought hard for the people's power, especially in Korea, the guys are fighting hard. There, socialism will be strong, because it is received with blood. It's good without blood, but capital doesn't give up power just like that. It is possible without blood in the main countries of the imperialist bloc, where the people have good political skills, where it is difficult and even impossible for the bourgeoisie to pour blood over the country. And in the colonial countries they can still act with weapons. This means that we must act more resolutely here in order to turn the struggle in these countries in our direction. This is how we weaken the imperialist bloc and strengthen the positions of world socialism.

The situation in the colonial and dependent countries must be carefully studied and new institutions of the Academy of Sciences created and activated along the line of political intelligence. Before the war, we turned our intelligence service from the intelligence service of the Comintern into the intelligence agency of the Soviet Union. And now we need to more actively involve people from the colonial countries in intelligence and train them to work there not for pure intelligence, but for the political work we need in these countries. We will prepare them

let them work under our leadership not to collect information for us, this is secondary in this case. Let them work for

their own peoples, we also need and benefit from this.

Otherwise, America will intercept us, they are rich and can act with the dollar. And we need to act with an idea and call people to a just life. If everything is explained to people correctly, they will understand everything in Africa properly and will follow us. This will suit us economically, because we can supply them with machines, and receive raw materials and food from them. In America, everyone eats bananas, and why can't we eat them in the USSR. We will pay honestly. Today, we must already think on a global scale and think with a good vision, 10 years ahead, no less. If we act correctly, we will grow stronger, and they will weaken. Then let the rest of the countries think about who to follow, the imperialist bloc or the socialist one.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

And here the thought of L.P. Beria worked in the right direction, but the Khrushchevites who came to power and the agents of influence surrounding them ruined the prospects for world socialism in this respect. And there were objective opportunities for expanding the zone of popular, and in the long term socialist, states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The politically correct and systematically sound policy of the USSR was supposed to turn the possibility into reality.

The US and the leading colonial powers, of course, had a strong position in the future Third World. They dominated the economy, the local elite was educated in the West, Western bourgeois propaganda also formed mass addictions.

However, the mass media influence on the masses of the colonial countries could not then be total. Television - as a means of mass clogging of minds and souls - exists

voval in those countries that later made up the "third world", in its infancy, like radio. Due to the mass illiteracy of the native population, a wide negative impact on the mass consciousness of the press was excluded.

Cleverly organized and thoughtful Soviet verbal agitation, up to the illegal training and sending of political commissars and the training of socialist-oriented local cadres, all this could turn the situation in the colonial and dependent countries in the direction of socialism. And this would not be the notorious "export of the revolution", but would be active opposition to the impending change of colonial signs in the rotten colonial empires.

In the second half of the 1950s, the national liberation movement, especially in black Africa, became widespread. The political development of the popular masses there was in its infancy, but these masses did not want to live in the old way and were ready to fight for a new life.

The United States sent its political emissaries around the world both in the form of USIA missions (UGA - United States Information Agency) and in the form of representatives of various, formally non-governmental, foundations. With a creative, active, assertive attitude to the situation (namely, this style was characteristic of Beria), the Soviet Union could also carry out similar work in black Africa, Asia and Latin America - wherever conditions arose for a broad insurrectionary movement and where it actually happened.

If Beria had been at the head of the Soviet Union in the 50s and 60s, then, presumably, the policy outlined above would have been implemented by him. For the Khrushchevites, morally and politically rotten, the Bolshevik, that is, politically uncompromising, methods of foreign policy activity in the emerging "third world" were impossible.

The formation of the Moscow University of Peoples' Friendship, which received his name after the assassination of the Congolese leader Patrice Lumumba, was a palliative measure.

100

As L.P. feared. Beria, the half-hearted, sluggish policy of the Khrushchev USSR in the "third world" world led to the fact that in general he went along the path of capitalist neo-colonialism, and not socialism.

The Bolsheviks are reproached for our repressive policy. But we have always suppressed the minority in the interests of the majority, there is no getting around it, the dictatorship of the proletariat must be a dictatorship. But we have always stood for democracy, as it is inherent in this very word. Demos is the people, and kratia is the power. It turns out the power of the people, but where was it established, when was it established? All the uprisings of the people were crushed with blood, and so it has always been. "Only in 1917 did the people in Russia crush the exploiters and their accomplices with their blood. And where they were afraid of blood, they crushed the people with blood, in Germany Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were torn to pieces, red Hungary was crushed. Kolchak so flooded Siberia with blood that the men who were against the Bolsheviks ran into the red partisans.

They poke us in the nose with terror, but who shot at Lenin? In a civil war, we could easily shoot any white general, even Kolchak, even Denikin, even Wrangel. But we did not resort to individual terror, it was stupid. And they went. The king was shot according to the situation and not the central government. If the whites had not unleashed a civil war, the tsar would still have been shot, but in court, because we would definitely judge him, and his wife too. There would have been no civil war, the daughters and son would have remained alive, but they would still have been imprisoned, because there was no way to let them out.

For us, terror and repression have been and will be a forced measure. Today they are again preparing individual terror, they have created an entire organization,

101

in order to kill Comrade Stalin, only this task is covered, they say, it is necessary to find a way to change Stalin's policy. This case will have to be widely opened already in 1953, the materials already exist, and we will make them public. Let them know who is shedding blood.

Reference and commentary by Sergei Kremlev:

In 1951, President Truman created a new government body, the Council for Psychological Strategy (Psychological Strategy Council, RZV). It included the US Deputy Secretary of Defense, the US Assistant Secretary of State, and the Director of the CIA. The composition is representative.

At the same time, the Union of Right Forces included the Stalin group (code designation PSB 0-40), which was headed by the executive director of the Union of Right Forces, J. Morgan. The group explored the possibility of removing Stalin from power according to the plan developed by the group, "Rip fog Sŷŷŷŷpŷ rŷŷŷŷpo 'got romeq". In addition, a campaign was planned to declare Stalin insane, the murders of Soviet diplomats were not ruled out, up to an attack on the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrei Yanuarievich Vyshinsky (for more details, see the journal Voprosy istorii, No. 6, 2006, p. 41, 44).

It is clear that the phrase "removal of Stalin from power" in fact meant the planning of the assassination of Stalin by the public services of the United States of America.

Such is the "democracy".

As you can see, the leadership of the USSR knew about the American plans to assassinate Stalin and were preparing to reveal them publicly. But neither Stalin nor Beria thought that the crime had already been prepared and



that it will be committed by people from Stalin's most seemingly trusted entourage with, which is almost certain, Khrushchev's sanctions.

In the world of capitalism, a criminal is, consider, for life. Units are corrected. If it dragged on

102

so delayed. And we immediately set the task - reforging. And it turned out massively, because the criminals were given a real case. If you want to become a man, if you want to get an honest specialty, work, we will appreciate it, and we will reduce the term, and we will reduce the criminal record, and we will even give you an order if you deserve it. Capitalism needs crime, it is impossible to do without it, there are many things that can only be done through criminal means. And crime is a burden to us, why do we need criminals. The labor force in the camps is also not free, you still need to build, feed, clothe and shoe. A free person works better, so from any point of view, crime is unprofitable for us. But where can you go, there is crime, it's another matter that a lot of petty crimes have accumulated, we need to move on to softening the repressive policy against petty crimes of an economic nature, especially if women. But even here you have to think. Here you can't go too far in one direction, and you can't go too far in the other, because petty theft is still theft, especially dangerous if the state has it, because the wrong psychology develops. Like, if you stole from a person, then this is a real crime, but if you stole from the state, then it's nobody's business, it's state-owned, and the state is still mine, so this is an excuse.

There is no excuse here. But relief for criminals is possible if there are extenuating circumstances. A single mother is a softening. But you still have to think.

We have always stood for labor re-education. And in Volgodon this has already been applied en masse. The masses were released ahead of schedule and awarded en masse. Where was it that the criminal was not just released ahead of schedule, it has long been practiced by them for exemplary behavior, and we do not just release and do not

103

for exemplary behavior, and he will go out there again, and we release him for heroic Labor for the good of the Motherland.

If a working person stumbles, he will easily straighten himself out if you give him the opportunity to justify it by work. An idler is always trash, even though he will live in the palace. We saw this well on the former princes and Russian aristocrats in exile. At least one of them became a major figure there, stood out in some way? No one, they became drivers and lackeys in restaurants. Only a handful of Russian capitalists were able to stay afloat, and that was almost all due to old stocks, and not new business. And ordinary people who left the Russian Empire for a better life in America and Canada, all settled there, because they knew how to work and worked. The whole world rests on Labor, only they keep quiet, and we have raised Labor to the highest height. Everyone will honestly work and work for the good of the people, and there will be no repressions, only against spies and traitors.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Reflections of L.P. Beria about the essence of the repressive policy in the USSR are certainly interesting, but it is useful to give a number of specific illustrations to them. Let's compare three large and very famous construction sites, where the labor of prisoners was widely used.

The White Sea-Baltic Canal is one of the largest construction projects of the first five-year plan. Construction began in the summer of 1930. end - May 1933. The canal opened the Ladoga and Onega lakes for maritime navigation and was of great national economic and military strategic importance.

The Moscow-Volga Canal is the largest construction project of the second five-year plan, it was built from 1932 to 1937. He was an integral part of the plan to turn Moscow into a "port of five

104

seas" and solved the most acute problem of industrial and domestic water supply of the rapidly growing capital.

Volga-Don Canal named after V.I. Lenin - one of the largest post-war hydraulic structures in the USSR Construction period - from 1950 to June 1952. The canal completed a grandiose program for the reconstruction and creation of deep-water inland navigation routes and at the same time solved the complex problem of irrigation and energy of the Lower Don water resources.

All three canals were laid with the extensive use of the labor of prisoners, but to call this labor "slave" means to humiliate the labor and fate of the "canal army" themselves. For many of them, working on the construction of canals has really become a "ticket to life". At the same time, as the country's capabilities grew at these three construction sites, the technical equipment, the level of organization of work, and the provision of prisoners and civilians, and finally, the mortality figures, changed!

Only at the construction site of the White Sea Canal and in the first years of the construction of the Moscow-Volga Canal, the mortality rate was significant. Thus, the mortality among Belbaltlag prisoners was as follows: in 1931 - 2.24% of the average annual number of prisoners in the camp, in 1932 - 2.03%, in 1933 - 10.56%. But 1933 is the year of famine in the country.

During the construction of the Moscow-Volga canal, the mortality rate in Dmitlag in 1933 was -16.1%, but already in 1934 - 3.88%; in 1935 - 2.3%; in 1936 - 1.4%; in 1937 - 0.9%.

For comparison, in Russia in 1913 the mortality rate among the entire population was 2.9%.

Already at the construction of the White Sea Canal, and even more so - the Volga-Moscow Canal, equipment was widely used. Only certified engineers among the builders of the Volga-Moscow Canal, there were three thousand people - civilians. As for Volgodon, here are the normative levels of mechanization established there: earthworks - 97%; preparation and transportation of concrete - 100%; concrete laying - 98%; rubble stone mining - 100%; stone mining and crushing it into rubble - 100%; gravel and sand mining - 100%; pile driving and mon

105

tazh of metal structures - 99%; construction of residential and industrial buildings - 90%; fastening of slopes and the bottom of the channel with reinforced concrete slabs - 50%.

The mortality rate in Volgodon was significantly lower than the national average - 0.746%.

But that's not all!

Here is another detail from the history of the White Sea Canal...

August 4, 1933 Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR M.I. Kalinin signed the Decree of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR "On the provision of benefits to participants in the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal named after comrade. Stalin", according to which "for selfless work on the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal" a conviction was expunged with the restoration of civil rights from 500 people according to the list provided by the OGPU of the USSR. The OGPU was instructed to "ensure further raising the qualifications in the construction business of the most talented workers from among the former repeat offenders and provide scholarships upon admission to educational institutions."

By the issuance of this Decree, the CEC had already completely exempted 12,484 people "from further serving measures of social protection", "as having fully recovered and become useful for socialist construction", and the terms were reduced for 59,516 people who "have shown themselves to be energetic construction workers". A number of prisoners were awarded orders, including the Order of Lenin.

This practice has become the norm, including in the Volgodon. On August 18, 1952, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Stalin signed the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On benefits for prisoners who distinguished themselves in the construction of the Volga-Don shipping canal named after V.I. Lenin. It provided for: personal early release of 15,000 prisoners, including 7,000 women who distinguished themselves in the construction of the canal; personal reduction of the term of imprisonment from 1 to 5 years for 35 thousand prisoners, including 5 thousand women.

3,000 people, including 1,000 women, were awarded orders and medals of the USSR.

106

When, where and what kind of society publicly honored and raised to high social heights those who worked in prison? Not just forgiving and letting go, but honored! Received high awards! Appreciated their work as valiant!

Back in the early 30s, the English businessman Gartel drove through the USSR. He was not interested in propaganda, but in real results and their causes. And his summary was as follows: "Enthusiasm was never born out of slavery. If Soviet Russia had depended on forced labor for the implementation of the five-year plan, it would have disintegrated the very next day.

Many people can lead. Few can lead well. But to get things off the ground or to move a new thing forward, you have to be able to do that. You have to have talent. But talent can also be nurtured, and more importantly, every talent can be noticed and supported. Immediately after the revolution, many talents showed up, but then there were few educated people, how hard it was with personnel and how hard it was without a good education. It was hard with the cadres when I came to the Central Committee of Georgia, it later became easier when new cadres were selected and trained.

Comrade Stalin then correctly threw the slogan "Cadres decide everything." They then decided. Now they decide and always will decide. There is something in our classics, maybe not everything is right. The role of personality in history may not be decisive. And the role of leading cadres may be decisive. And the pictures just don't show up.

This should also be written in the Program about the most important role of searching for promising personnel, and then educating and placing leading personnel. And it is necessary to note the role of personnel control.

For almost forty years of Soviet power, a colossal shift has taken place here. When I started

107

to work in the Azerbaijan Cheka, and then in the GruzChK, it was hard with personnel.

When I arrived in Moscow for the NKVD, things immediately went well, because there were many smart, strong young cadres, because Yezhov, not to those who will remember, did the right thing by recruiting young engineers from production, from the Komsomol.

Already I also took from strong party cadres, but also from production, not from the chancellery.

And we quickly set things right in the NKVD, and the Economic Directorate began to work harder than the Slave Krin.

Help from Sergei Kremlev:

Rabkrin - Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate, RKI - body of state control in the economy. It arose after the October Revolution in the form of the People's Commissariat of State Control (since March 1919, Stalin was the People's Commissar concurrently), then it was transformed into the People's Commissariat of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection (from 1923 to 1934). From 1940 to 1957, it existed as the People's Commissariat (Ministry) of state control.

Without strong cadres, we couldn't even pull out the war, and then. And now we have started this work. Everything is in order, people are working and working, there are successes, and if things don't go well, we will slap a reprimand - pull up.

No, we are going to fail in terms of personnel and political education. There is arrogance and swindle, and they hardly understand that our leader must be a Bolshevik, even if the party is renamed. A Bolshevik in a socialist state is a leader who always puts the state interest before the personal or private one that belongs to his organization. If you are

108

today he forgot the state interest to the detriment of the state for the sake of his enterprise. To look good, tomorrow you will forget the interest of the enterprise for the sake of personal. And there is not far from rebirth. The staffing issue will only get worse.

+\$

I have already lived a great life. If you remember everything, and you do not believe that everything happened to me. Churchill (so in the text. - S.K.) was in the womb, and already knew that he would be at the very top of society and would have power.

What did I know? To master literacy, to know arithmetic and the Russian language well, at first I didn't think of more. And where to think, when I was at the very bottom, below is already poverty. Who raised me like me, who raised me? The revolution raised, but what does revolution mean? The revolution is the people. The people and raised, so how can they not serve. If you were raised, and you didn't give a damn, then you're not a man, but the last bastard, PIG.

I've been working all my life, how else? If you trust, then work it out. It's bad that there are young people who look at this as a common thing, but how could it be otherwise?

But it was different! You're smart, well, fuck you. There is a dad, no, go to hell... You have money, no, go to hell... And if there is a couple, then you are smart and everything is dear to you, even though you are a fool stuffed and don't understand. That's how it was.

It also needs to be said somehow. He spoke to comrade Stalin, Churchill writes, but what are we not allowed to do? Comrade Stalin thought, said: "Churchill is supported by his masters and his fee. He can lie, but we can't. We either tell the truth or

109

be silent. Deeds will speak for us, the state, the people, the party will follow them. We need to think through every word in public."

Then he thought, said: "But you, Lavrenty, write, maybe our time will come, when our word will only become ours, and the state will be able to do without us. We are working not to be called geniuses later, but to make the whole of Russia become a home for all geniuses. A real genius will always be for socialism, it always has been, and a thousand years ago."

well well

It would be nice to live at least another 20 years (on March 29, 1953, L.P. Beria turned only fifty-four years old. - S.K.). It's the devil knows what we can do in these 20 years!

No one will ever turn against us with a war, everyone has fought back. And what prospects! What new generations are rising! The war took away millions of supporters from the Soviet Power, but now new millions are growing. During the war, the boy was 10 years old or 12 years old there, he drank everything, and now he is graduating from the institute or finished, making a rocket and dreaming of flying to the moon. And it will fly, but we can still see it and work for it. With such boys, you can do anything if you lead them correctly. Now I am working with the most intelligent guys, physicists, engineers, builders.

Happy people, for another 5 years, they will live and laugh like children, why not. We have secured the world and will provide it even stronger, we are building a lot, and we will be even more, the people are getting an education, we will shorten the working day, we will build stadiums, theaters, new resorts, work, rest, develop.

110

We are talking about building communism, but there are two camps in the world, and how long will there be two camps? Capitalism, I think, will exist until socialism becomes materially richer.

In terms of culture, we have already surpassed them, our people have developed greatly during the thirty years of Soviet power, they do not care about this, on the contrary, and for us the higher the education, the better. But in terms of culture we are ahead, and in terms of living standards the imperialist bloc is higher. This is understandable, especially America profited from the war, there was no great destruction in Europe, and they have been developing the economy for many centuries, in addition, due to colonial and dependent countries, there is a lot of replenishment. And we need to raise the material level through a conscious attitude to work and the introduction of science. Now we are advancing this cause colossally, we need to develop it, and then we can build communism not in speeches, but in life.

Comrade Stalin sets the great task of achieving a 5-hour working day. If we achieve this, it will be a great upheaval. At nine he began work, at 2 o'clock it was already over, without a break. Dinner and free time. We will bypass capitalism on this alone, they can't do that, give them profit, and give them workers - and how Russians can do it in 5 hours and live well. No, give us socialism and Soviet power too, we also want to live like people. This will be the peaceful offensive of communism.

Communism is possible if the number of communists grows in life not for fear, not for a bonus, but for conscience, those who are interested in working and living, who know how to work and relax, but not like that, on dances, but with a soul to develop .

Sport is a must for everyone, if the working day is 5 hours, there will be enough for everything, you will have to study all your life. It's been 10 years, get back on

111

a couple of months at the desk, remember the history, geography. And if you know, pass the exam and walk these two months. We don't need ignoramuses, we need communists without exception, and what kind of communist are you if you don't know anything and grab your heart at forty years old. We didn't have time, but you have, come on, develop, dear, the Soviet Power gave you, use it and strengthen it yourself.

And so it is all over the world.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

In this book, the sequence of Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria's notes does not always correspond to the sequence that took place in the electronic version transmitted to me. Something

I rearranged, and somewhere kept the sequence of the original. Sometimes I combined two or three records into one, without specifically stipulating this.

However, I put the above entry as the last entry in the book quite deliberately. Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria dreamed of communism and believed that it was possible. And he believed in this not as a fanatic, but as a practical romantic.

In his daily life, most often scheduled by the minute, Beria could not afford public dreams. As a rule, he focused people on specific things that needed to be done today, or at least tomorrow. But Beria knew how to orient his comrades-in-arms to a long-term perspective. All, in fact, the achievements of Soviet atomic and rocket science and technology, which became a reality in the second half of the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s, were based on those long-term plans that were laid down during the Beria, under his leadership and with his participation.

If Beria had become Stalin's successor - not a formal successor, but a successor in fact, which was possible only with the strengthening of Malenkov's position as the formal leader in the Malenkov-Beria "tandem", then

112

the fate of Beria, and the fate of Malenkov, and the fate of the Soviet Union, world socialism and world communism would have been different.

And the point is not that Beria personally would have turned the course of events in a direction that was creative and happy for the cause of the USSR and communism. The fact is that of the entire Stalinist team headed by Stalin, except for Stalin, only Beria knew how to fully rely on people.

Talented and humane, without lisping and often outwardly tough, he knew how to select people, trust them and manage them so that people turned out to be capable of outstanding results.

Communism in the USSR, if the USSR after the death of Stalin was developed by Beria, taking into account a number of mistakes of the late Stalin, would have been quite possible. It is possible not as a society of the most complete material abundance (who needs it, this is the most complete, and what are its limits?), but as a classless society of developed and educated individuals who are free in their social creativity, consciously uniting in a collective where collective life is turns out to be more interesting and complete than the isolated one.

Such communism, first in the USSR and then in the world, was possible and still possible in the future.

And, following L.P. Beria, I repeat:

COMMUNISM IS POSSIBLE!

SPEECH L.P. BERIA OF THE LAST YEARS OF LIFE

From the compiler and commentator:

This section contains (abbreviated) the texts of three speeches by L.P. Beria of the last years of his life: report at the solemn meeting of the Moscow Soviet on November 6, 1951, speech at the XIX: Congress of the CPSU (b) - CPSU and mourning speech at the funeral of I.V. Stalin.

It was a high honor for any member of the Politburo to make a report at the solemn meeting of the Moscow Soviet, dedicated to the next anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and the fact that in 1951 this report was entrusted by Stalin L.P. Beria, proves the high status of the latter in the eyes of the former.

The style of such reports was then already defined as very dry, but informative. No special oratorical frills were required, but the structure of the report was quite definite. But this did not mean that this or that speaker did not have the opportunity to determine certain priorities himself, enliven the report with certain details and express his view on the situation. Another thing is that the essence of such reports (actually, state documents) was not a personal matter of the speaker, and at least one "reviewer" of the report was Stalin himself. But this did not negate the great preliminary work of the one who was instructed to make the report.

Analysis of the text of L.P. Beria shows that the structure and topics within the sections of the report are determined

114

The speaker himself did the work, and then his apparatus prepared for him specific numerical and other factual data. At the same time, the main work on the report was carried out, nevertheless, clearly by its author himself - not only formal, but also actual.

The speech at the 20th Congress is a more individualized document, and this is also quite understandable and understandable.

The most individual mourning speech of L.P. Beria, pronounced by him at the funeral of I.V. Stalin on March 9, 1953. This speech is devoted to a separate chapter "March 9, 1953. Beria's Oath" in my book "Why They Killed Stalin", to which I refer the interested reader.

I think that acquaintance with the three documents on which L.P. Beria, will be useful from any point of view. On the other hand, acquaintance with them will allow you to immerse yourself in the problems and atmosphere of that time, to better understand what the reality of Soviet socialism was in the early 50s, when the post-war restoration of the national economy of the USSR was basically completed and a new stage in the development of socialism began. .

Report at the solemn meeting

Moscow Soviet November 6, 1951 (abbreviated)

Comrades!

The peoples of the Soviet Union are celebrating today the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, illuminated by the genius of Lenin, which opened the way for mankind to a new, socialist world. Each year of movement along this path brings new successes to our Motherland.

All the activities of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government for the period from the 33rd to the 34th anniversary of the October Revolution, like all the years after the death of the great Lenin, took place under the

115

under the leadership of our leader Comrade Stalin. Comrade Stalin, with sagacity of genius, orients the Party and the people in the most complex phenomena of domestic and international life and outlines the prospects for further development. The inexhaustible energy of Comrade Stalin in the daily management of both large and small matters, his ability to determine the main tasks of the Soviet state and to direct all our forces towards their solution, ensure the peoples of the Soviet Union great victories in the building of communism.

The past year was the year of completion of the first post-war five-year plan. The Soviet people and all our friends abroad were happy to learn that the post-war five-year plan for the restoration and development of the national economy of the USSR, for the implementation of which our people had to struggle in difficult conditions to heal the grave wounds inflicted by the war, has been fulfilled.

successfully... Successes in peaceful construction led to a further rise in the material and cultural level of the working people.

In the field of foreign policy, the Soviet Union continued to wage a tireless struggle for peace, which raised its international prestige still higher.

Throughout the world over the past year, two poles, two centers of attraction, have become even more pronounced. On the one hand, the Soviet Union, leading the camp of socialism and democracy, as the center of attraction for all progressive forces fighting to prevent a new war and to consolidate peace, for the right of the peoples to arrange their own lives. On the other hand, the United States of America, heading the camp of imperialism, as the center of attraction for aggressive and reactionary forces all over the world, striving to unleash a new world

116

war to plunder and enslave other peoples.

In the camp of socialism and democracy, the past year has been a year of further growth and rallying of forces...

In the camp of imperialism, the past year has been a year of new sharpening of internal and external contradictions...

#### NEW SUCCESSES IN PEACE CONSTRUCTION IN THE USSR

For our country, 1951 is a year of further upsurge of the socialist economy and culture...

The results of work in the field of economic construction for ten months of this year show that the national economic plan of 1951 will be fulfilled and exceeded. Industrial output is increasing by more than 15 percent compared to last year and will double the output of the pre-war 1940.

<...>

Almost two-thirds of the increase in industrial output in the current year will come from an increase in labor productivity...

The reduction in the cost of production, as Comrade Stalin repeatedly pointed out, is an indicator of the quality of the work of industry, one of the most important sources of accumulation in the national economy. At the same time, it is an indispensable condition for lowering prices and, consequently, for an increase in the material well-being of the working people...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Underline L.P. Beria of the value of the factor of the cost of production and the growth of labor productivity -

117

significant fact. It would be naive to think that even in the highest Soviet leadership on all economic issues there was complete unanimity, established by someone personally by Stalin. There were enough disagreements. An illustrative example is the major post-war dispute between Molotov and Kaganovich on the topic of how the work of railway transport should be evaluated - by the shaft, or, so to speak, "assortment". Molotov stood on the side of the "shaft", considering ton-kilometers as the main standard indicator. Kaganovich, on the other hand, very sensibly and knowingly arguing his position, believed that it was necessary to achieve the fulfillment of the transportation plan by type of cargo, otherwise the railway workers would transport half-empty wagons around the country,



winding kilometers, or some pig-iron ingots, gaining tons. In the end, Kaganovich's sound point of view won out, but many copies had been broken before.

So it is with cost. Not everyone understood the paramount importance of this naturally main indicator for a healthy, normal, that is, fundamentally socialist economy. Beria, as we see, understood this meaning.

All branches of heavy and light industry achieved a significant increase in production this year.

The production of ferrous metals is growing significantly... The Soviet Union is now smelting about the same amount of steel as England and France. Belgium and Sweden combined...

The increase in the production of non-ferrous and rare metal VOCs achieved this year is no less significant.

In the ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, remarkable cadres of workers, engineering and technical workers and heads of enterprises have grown up ...

The coal mining plan is being successfully implemented...

The Soviet Government and Comrade Stalin personally show constant concern for every possible

118

facilitating the work of miners and improving their living conditions. Unlike the capitalist countries, where the miners are the most downtrodden and destitute people, in the Soviet state the miners are surrounded by attention and honor. Workers in the coal industry occupy first place in terms of wages among workers in other industries. As a result, we have a permanent qualified staff of miners who ensure the successful development of the coal industry.

Even more significant are the successes of our oil industry...

On a large scale, work has been launched on the construction and expansion of oil refining manufacturing plants...

It can be said with certainty that the task set by Comrade Stalin—to increase oil production to 60 million tons a year—will be fulfilled ahead of schedule.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

L.P. It was not by chance that Beria began the economic bloc with metallurgy, coal and oil industries. It was his traditional "bush" of industries, in the work and development of which he put a lot of effort and soul.

But there was one more hitch - a promising figure for oil production of 60 million tons per year.

In an essay about Beria, published in the third volume of his personal diaries "We live with the atomic bomb", I described in detail the collision with this figure, and now I will briefly remind you that the former chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR in the Brezhnev years and the former People's Commissar (Minister ) of the oil industry of the USSR Baibakov subsequently denigrated Beria in every possible way. Like, Beria allegedly recklessly assured Stalin that it was possible to quickly reach the level of oil production of the notorious 60 million tons. Baibakov allegedly, when he was at a meeting of Stalin with voters

v

119

At the Bolshoi Theater in February 1946, I heard the latter's statement about the task of bringing oil production to 60 million tons in 15 years, "his hair stood on end."

It is sad and almost funny that in real time, in his speech at the 19th Congress, Baibakov said this (I quote from the text of the Pravda newspaper):

"Comrade Stalin, in his historic speech at the pre-election meeting of voters in the Stalinist electoral district of the mountains. Moscow on February 9, 1946, among other tasks of great national importance, formulated a program for a further powerful rise in the oil industry: to ensure that the oil industry could produce up to 60 million tons of oil annually. To accomplish these tasks, Comrade Stalin pointed out, perhaps three new five-year plans, if not more, would go.

"But this thing can be done and we must do it," said Comrade Stalin.

Baibakov, for me personally, is a person of little respect in general, although in the Stalinist era he worked a lot and not bad. However, he, put forward, by the way, by Beria, knew the reserves of his industry worse than his boss.

Here are the stats...

On the eve of the war, the USSR produced 34 million tons per year, immediately after the war - 19 million tons.

1946 + 15 years = 1961.

So, in 1960, when the name of Beria had long been cursed, 148 (one hundred and forty-eight) tons of oil were produced in the USSR, not counting the fact that natural gas production increased 15 (fifteen) times by this year.

Below in the report of L.P. Beria also talks about other sectors of the national economy, including the chemical and machine-building industries, and here Beria also did not just "voice" someone else's thoughts, but spoke about what he knew well.

120

Indeed, in the activities of the "atomic-rocket" Special Committee under the leadership of Beria, the issues of chemistry and mechanical engineering, including precision engineering, occupied the most important place.

Great success has been achieved in the development of electrification.

Our chemical industry is growing year by year...

<...>

Our economic development would be unthinkable without the continuous growth and improvement of domestic machine building, the basis of the technical progress of the entire national economy...

This year we are producing a steam turbine with a capacity of 150,000 kilowatts. A turbine of this capacity is being created for the first time in the world... In 1951, the engineering industry produced more than 400 new types of machines and mechanisms.

Our machine builders have the right to be proud of their success in the production of the most sophisticated modern equipment, geophysical, electromechanical, electronic, electrovacuum and other precision instruments.

Thanks to the successful development of industry and the growth in the production of agricultural raw materials, the output of consumer goods is expanding significantly. This year, on the initiative of Comrade Stalin, the Government took steps to increase the production of foodstuffs and industrial goods in excess of the annual plan. IN

As a result of this, the population will receive more than in 1950 ... fabrics - by 24 percent, knitwear - by 35 percent, shoes - by 12 percent, meat and meat products - by 20 percent, fish products - on

121

8 percent, vegetable oil - by 35 percent, animal oil - by 8 percent, sugar - by 24 percent, tea - by 38 percent, cultural and household goods: bicycles - almost twice, radios - by 25 percent, watches - by 11 percent, cameras - by 39 percent, sewing machines - by 28 percent, furniture - by 44 percent.

Our industry is already beginning to mass-produce television sets, room refrigerators, washing machines, and other household appliances.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

There was something to be proud of here - five years ago, almost the entire European part of the country lay in ruins. Now the first recovery period was coming to an end, and Beria, with well-founded pride, reported these, in fact, victorious figures. The Soviet Union still lived modestly, the purchase of a wrist watch was a whole event for an average family, not to mention the purchase of a radio receiver, but after some ten years it became almost an ordinary fact.

As you can see, our industry is making serious progress. But we should not forget about shortcomings in the work of individual enterprises, which, due to poor organization of production and poor use of advanced technology, do not fulfill the tasks of increasing labor productivity and reducing costs, allow excessive consumption of raw materials and fuel, as well as losses from marriage. Eliminating these shortcomings would make it possible to obtain additional significant savings.

122

Individual enterprises, fulfilling and overfulfilling the plan for gross output, do not always fulfill the plan for the production of the most important types of products. The leaders of these enterprises apparently want to make their work easier and produce those products that require less effort and trouble. It is time for them to understand that the state needs not every fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plan, but only such a plan as will provide the national economy with the products it needs.

In our socialist economy, every leader, whether he is in a big or a small job, must put the interests of the state above all else and strictly observe state discipline. We must resolutely get rid of the narrow-departmental approach to business that is still observed among individual business executives, which is detrimental to the interests of our planned economy.

The current year has been marked by a further upsurge in our socialist agriculture.  
stva.

<...>

Agriculture annually receives a large number of the latest machines from the state. This year, it will receive 137,000 tractors converted to 15-horsepower, 54,000 grain harvesters, of which 29,000 are self-propelled, as well as two million other agricultural machines.

and guns.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

I draw the reader's attention to the figures for the supply of agricultural machinery to the countryside. The Appendix will provide some data from the Stalinist Directives of the 20th Congress on the 5th

five-year plan, as well as in terms of the amount of effort associated with the implementation of the already Khrushchev

123

th plan for the development of virgin lands, and then we will return to these figures.

Great work is being done to electrify agriculture...

<...>

Our country is implementing a broad construction program. The scale of capital construction is increasing every year...

Our builders have achieved notable success in reducing costs and reducing construction time. However, they still have much to do. It is necessary, first of all, to establish proper order in the organization of work on construction sites, to use construction mechanisms more productively, to better organize labor and to drastically reduce overhead costs. It is also necessary to eliminate the excesses still existing in the projects and estimates, which increase the cost of construction.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

A professional builder and architect, Beria knew what he was talking about here too. He was a supporter of the rational style, and if you look at the architectural appearance and the general layout of Soviet "atomic", for example, cities, why L.P. Beria was directly related, then we will see just the embodiment of rationality and the absence of excesses as an almost artistic, and not just an economic principle.

A special place in our construction, as you know, is occupied by the largest hydraulic structures under construction on the Volga, the Don, the Dnieper and the Amu Darya. These construction projects are unparalleled in the world...

124

Already in 1952, the first of these structures, the Volga-Don waterway, was put into operation. With the opening of this route, all the seas of the European part of the USSR will be connected into a single transport system.

The construction of these structures was begun on the initiative of Comrade Stalin, who shows tireless concern for the welfare and prosperity of our Motherland, for facilitating work and improving the living conditions of the Soviet people ...

Unlike the countries of capitalism, where production serves the purpose of gaining and enriching a handful of exploiters, in our country the interests of the working people lie at the basis of the development of the entire national economy...

The Soviet Government is pursuing a policy of systematically lowering the prices of consumer goods. In March of this year, a new, fourth in recent years, reduction in state retail prices for food and industrial goods was carried out, which ensured a further increase in the real wages of workers and employees and a reduction in the peasants' expenses for the purchase of cheaper industrial goods. .

<...>

The Party and the Government show constant concern for improving the living conditions of the working people. In the current year, residential buildings with a total area of about 27 million square meters are being put into operation in cities and workers' settlements, and 400,000 residential buildings will be built by collective farmers in rural areas.

It is very gratifying that, as a result of the growth in the well-being of the people and the success of Soviet health care in our country, mortality

125

decreased by half compared with the pre-war 1940 (applause) and even more reduced infant mortality. The annual net increase in the population of the USSR for several years already exceeds the increase in population in 1940 and amounts to more than three million souls.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Is it necessary to comment in detail on the last paragraph in the light of the progressive extinction of the population of the Yeltsin-like "Rossiyania"?

In the Soviet 1980s, the birth rate in the RSFSR was at the level of 15 births per 1,000 population, and the death rate was at the level of 9 deaths per 1,000 population.

By 2000, the birth rate had fallen to 9, while the death rate had risen to almost 17.

By 2006, the situation had improved slightly: the birth rate was about 12, the death rate was 15. However, the Kremlin's current boast about further growth in the birth rate is worth little.

Firstly, the capitalist Yeltsinoid cannibals (the definition of the former Yeltsin loyalist Mikhail Poltoranin) already have at least two tens of millions of excess deaths.

Secondly, a certain increase in the birth rate is associated with the naive hopes of young generations for the "Putin plan", etc. However, there is no real solid base - as it was in the USSR of Stalin and Beria - under these hopes there is not and cannot be.

While in the capitalist camp the imperialist cannibals are busy inventing various "scientific" means of exterminating the best part of mankind and reducing the birth rate, in our country, as Comrade Stalin said, the most valuable capital is people, and the well-being and happiness of people are main concern of the state.

126

The issues of training and education of specialists for all sectors of the economy and culture have always occupied and continue to occupy an important place in the system of measures of our state... Currently, more than 5 million specialists with completed higher or secondary technical education work in our country. ..

In all our achievements, Soviet science plays a large role. Recently, our scientists have solved a number of the most important scientific problems of national economic and defense significance. In a number of branches of knowledge, Soviet scientists have taken first place in the development of world science...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Of all the Soviet leaders, L.P. Beria was most closely and fruitfully associated with Soviet scientists and problems of science. Head of the Special Committee, superintendent of atomic and rocket work, he knew directly about the achievements and possibilities of Soviet science - as a result of his own daily business contacts with scientists and a good knowledge of their problems.

<...>

Directing the main forces and resources of the country to the further development of the national economy and culture; the Party and the Government do not lose sight of the need to strengthen the defense. Historical experience has fully confirmed Comrade Stalin's warning that the country of victorious socialism, surrounded by capitalism, must be constantly ready to repulse the possible aggression of the imperialist powers. This year, as always, the Party and the Government did everything to heroically

127

The Soviet people, in the pathos of creative labor, erecting the great edifice of communism, could no longer be afraid for the fate of their country. The Soviet Army and Navy, possessing unsurpassed moral and combat qualities known to the whole world, have at their disposal all types of modern weapons in order to deal a crushing blow to anyone who, despite the convincing lessons of history, dares to attack our Motherland. (Prolonged, stormy applause.)

As is known, the decisive condition for our victories is the advantages of our social and state system, born of the October Revolution. One of the main expressions of these advantages is that the Soviet system for the first time unleashed and liberated the great forces of the people, brought to life powerful activity and inexhaustible creative initiative of the masses liberated from capitalist exploitation. It is precisely this activity and initiative of the masses that is the most important source of the invincible forces of communism...

Soviet people invariably achieve success in their work because arrogance and complacency are alien to them, because they never rest content with what they have achieved and measure their achievements mainly in the light of the great tasks of the future. Criticism and self-criticism, as Comrade Stalin teaches us, is the law of our development, the decisive means of overcoming all routine and inertia, all the old, dying, which hinders our victorious movement forward. The level of consciousness of the masses, the ideological and theoretical training of personnel largely determine the effectiveness of

128

Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. As always, questions of communist education of the masses are at the center of our Party's attention...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

To the modern eye (especially to those who are familiar with the "cardboard" language of the reports of the Brezhnev "epoch"), some turns and expressions in the report of L.P. Beria may also seem official and unexpressive. But we must not forget that in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev "epochs" if they spoke about, for example, the importance of criticism and self-criticism, then this was nothing more than a dogmatic and hypocritical repetition of what Stalin had sincerely and in a businesslike manner said. , and members of his "team", including L.P. Beria.

Actually, as I guess, already after the assassination of Stalin and Beria, various kinds of "referents" and "speechwriters" of the Khrushchevites and Brezhnevists used the reports not only of Stalin, but also of Beria for "creative" rewriting, without, of course, referring to the original source .

In the next paragraph of the report following this comment, Beria used the capacious and precise expression "the unity of material and moral forces", defining such unity as one of the main foundations of the power of the State.

If you think about it, Beria gave a brilliant and extremely concise formula for ensuring the prosperity of any socialist society for all time. During the Brezhnev era, during the time of the evil memory of the catastrophe, the material forces of the USSR were enormous and far exceeded the material forces of the USSR in Stalin's time. And the material wealth of the USSR in the 70s and 80s was a much larger percentage of the material wealth of the whole world than

it was in Stalin's time. Nevertheless, the Brezhnev-Gorbachev USSR collapsed overnight and collapsed not least because the material forces of society were no longer supported by the corresponding moral forces of society.

In Stalin's USSR, the unity of material and moral forces that Beria spoke of was real and effective.

129

therefore, the USSR of that time was able to withstand the most difficult trials, won really great victories and rightfully set itself really great tasks for the future.

The indestructible unity of the will and aspirations of the peoples of our country, the unity of their material and moral forces is one of the main foundations of the might of our Motherland. It is thanks to this unity that our state is able to solve such great tasks that the most daring minds of mankind could not dream of before.

#### THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

The enormous scope of peaceful construction in our country speaks eloquently of the peaceful nature of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and exposes the slanderers who rant about the aggressive intentions of our Government.

"Not a single state," says Comrade Stalin, "including the Soviet state, can develop in full (as in the text of the report. — S.K.) civilian industry, start great construction projects like hydroelectric power plants on Volga, Dnieper, Amu-Darya, requiring tens of billions of budget expenditures, continue the policy of systematically reducing prices for consumer goods, which also requires tens of billions of budget expenditures, invest hundreds of billions in the restoration of the national economy destroyed by the German occupiers and at the same time, at the same time, to multiply their Armed Forces, to expand the military industry. It is not difficult to understand that such a reckless policy would lead to the bankruptcy of the state ... "

130

The peaceful policy of the Soviet state was born of the October Socialist Revolution. More than thirty years of history of Soviet power shows that the October Revolution is a revolution of creation, the planned construction of a new, communist society. The wars imposed on us by our enemies only hindered our great cause...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

A well-known falsifier of history, a former prominent "fighter of the ideological front of the Central Committee of the CPSU" Leonid Mlechin, in a book about Ekaterina Furtseva, claims that, allegedly, only after the death of Stalin on March 16, 1953 (third) year, Georgy Malenkov called on the West to negotiate, and a year later, On March 12, 1954, he "renounced the former ideas of the Soviet leadership about the inevitability of war and that it would help destroy world imperialism."

Alas, Leonid Mlechin and the truth are incompatible things, and a simple comparison of the above thesis from the report of L.P. Beria dated November 6, 1951 (first) year with the statements of Mlechin once again confirms this.

<...>

The peoples made enormous sacrifices and hardships in the cause of defeating the aggressive fascist bloc in the hope that after victory they would be provided with the conditions for peaceful development. Even at the height of the Second World War, Comrade Stalin warned that it was not enough to win the war;

to ensure lasting and lasting peace among peoples. Before the blood of the millions of victims on the battlefields had cooled, the American-British imperialists began plotting a new war...

There is no need to enumerate known facts. It suffices to point out that the United States

131

The Americans are openly restoring two hotbeds of war—in the West—in the zone of Germany, and in the East—in the zone of Japan, the liquidation of which in the last war cost the freedom-loving peoples millions of human lives and demanded colossal material sacrifices and incredible suffering from them.

.Moreover, contrary to common sense, in... the restoration of German militarism, the most active part is taken by the current rulers of France, whose people in one human generation twice experienced all the horrors of German aggression. ..American bosses find it more convenient to carry out their plans for Germany through the hands of obliging people from the French under the guise of the "Schumann plan", "Pleven plan", etc.

Help from Sergei Kremlev:

The Schuman Plan, named after the Atlanticist French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, was put forward on May 9, 1950. It was a project of an international state-monopoly association of enterprises of the ferrous metallurgy, coal and iron ore industries of all European countries covered by American "aid" under the Marshall plan. As a result of the implementation of the plan, it was supposed to create a European political and economic, and in the future, a military grouping on the basis of the so-called "Franco-German reconciliation".

The "Pleven Plan" was put forward on October 24, 1950 by French Prime Minister René Pleven (in 1949-1950 and in March 1952-June 1954, Minister of National Defense). It was a plan to create a European Defense Community, a purely Western European military bloc with the participation of the Federal Republic of Germany, with the establishment of a "European committee of ministers for

132

Rhone" and the subsequent creation of the "European army". The plan was formally approved by the US, British, and French foreign ministers at the Washington meeting in September 1951.

In fact, it was a plan for the remilitarization of the FRG, and although it was formalized in the form of the Paris Treaty of 1952, its implementation failed due to opposition, in particular, in the French National Assembly, which rejected the Paris Treaty in August 1954.

Recently, the American-British bloc pushed through the so-called peace treaty with Japan, and the USA also concluded a military agreement with her, openly starting to restore Japanese militarism. World public opinion is indignant at the fact that the great Chinese people, who suffered the most from Japanese aggression and made a huge contribution to the defeat of Japanese imperialism, were excluded from participation in the peace treaty with Japan, while the Americans are trumping the signatures of the representatives of Honduras, Costa -Riki and similar small semi-colonial states, which not only did not participate in the defeat of imperialist Japan, but in the person of their numerous merchants and landowners profited from the war with her ...

<...>



The aggressive policy of the American bloc is most clearly exposed by the military intervention of the United States in Korea. Representatives of the USA frustrated all the proposals of the USSR and other peace-loving states to stop the American aggression in Korea, and now they are dragging out the talks that have begun in Kaesong in every possible way.

We are confident that the courageous Korean people will find a worthy way out of the provoked

133

Americans of a bloody conflict, and thus will once again show the world that no force can enslave a people that has the will to fight and win.

The United States is stubbornly trying to turn the United Nations into an instrument of war. Under pressure from the United States, it provided its flag to cover up American aggression in Korea, and then, in violation of the ancestral rights of peoples, declared the People's Republic of China the aggressor. Honest people all over the world cannot but agree with the justice of Comrade Stalin's words that "in essence, the UN is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, acting at the behest of the American aggressors."

Of late, the pace of preparations for war has intensified in the camp of imperialism...

The slightest manifestations of anti-war sentiment are ruthlessly suppressed, especially in the USA, and fascist-police methods are being implanted in all levels of the state apparatus...

Wisconsin State Senator Chester Dempsey recently wrote in the Capital Times:

"We used to be surprised at the servility of the Germans, who were under the influence of the propaganda of Hitler and Goebbels. Now we are in an even worse position than the Germans once were. We have complete control over our thoughts, we are in the hands of the military and its slanderous clicks.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Fooled by Goebbelzin propaganda, "dear Russians" may not believe that a US senator could say such a thing about his "democratic" country, and about the neo-"totalitarian" USSR. But here is another quote, unexpected for the "Russian" simpletons, referring to a little more

134

later times. In the early 1960s, New York City Mayor Wagner officially admitted that living conditions in the shantytowns of New York City, home to over two million people, were "worse than anywhere on the globe except Hong Kong."

US statesmen became so carried away that they began to transfer police methods to international forums. Perhaps Hitler's political gesheftsmachers could look forward to the swindling methods of the American diplomats led by Truman at the conference in San Francisco.

In the United States, the absorption of the state apparatus by the capitalist monopolies is intensifying. If earlier the actual owners of the country - financial and industrial magnates - themselves remained in the shadows, leaving their political clerks to protect their interests in the field of politics, now they directly take over the administrative-political and diplomatic apparatus of the United States. It is known that the most important affairs of state are handled by a businessman from the Morgan group - Charles Wilson, who unceremoniously places at the most important levers of the state apparatus people from the largest associations of billionaires - Morgan, Rockefeller, Mellon, Dupont and others,

closely connected with each other not only by economic, but also by family ties. They shamelessly use the country's economy in the interests of billionaires.

And at a time of such rampant plutocracy and policing in his own country, President Truman has the courage to shamelessly rant about the "lack of democracy" in the Soviet Union, in

135

that very Soviet Union, where, as is known, the police and plutocracy have long since been overthrown, and where all power belongs to the demos, the people.

These, comrades, are the facts...

<...>

Our foreign policy is based on the might of the Soviet state. Only naive politicians can regard its peaceful character as our lack of self-confidence. The Soviet people have shown the world more than once how they can defend their Motherland...

<...>

We are persistently fighting for peace, not only because we do not need war, but also because the Soviet people, who created the most just social system under the banner of Lenin and Stalin, consider aggressive war the gravest crime against humanity, the greatest calamity for the common people. people all over the world.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Once again I refer the reader to the insinuations of Leonid Mlechin to compare them with the above thesis of L.P. Beria, expressed openly during Stalin's lifetime and with Stalin's approval.

But if the imperialist predators interpret the peacefulness of our people as their weakness, then they will face an even more shameful failure than their predecessors experienced in military adventures against the Soviet state ...

The ruling circles of the USA and Britain are trying to deceive world public opinion by talking about having to arm themselves in the face of a military attack from the Soviet Union.

136

False talk about the Soviet threat, about the insincerity of Soviet peace proposals, is not new. Under the guise of these conversations, after the First World War, the imperialists of Europe and America were arming fascist Germany... However, venerable diplomats from the American-British bloc think in vain that the memory of the peoples is short, that it is so easy to entangle them with lies.

The peoples of the world judge the policies of governments not by words but by deeds. The Soviet Union has never shied away from the exact fulfillment of its treaty obligations ...

In order to justify their aggressive policy towards the Soviet Union, the leaders of the imperialist states slanderously attribute to the Soviet people the denial of the possibility of peaceful coexistence of the two systems.

Back in the first years of Soviet power, the founder of our state, Lenin, put forward the principle of peace and agreement with the capitalist states. "Our path is right," said Lenin, "we are for peace and agreement, but we are against bondage and bondage terms of the agreement." This

the Leninist principle underlies the policy of the Soviet state... Comrade Stalin also determined the real basis for agreements between the USSR and the capitalist states

"Export and import," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "are the most suitable ground for such agreements."

<...>

The peaceful coexistence of the two systems presupposes political agreements... But the imperialists do not need agreements. They are afraid of agreements with the Soviet Union, because such agreements ... will make unnecessary the arms race, which gives them billions of super-profits ...

137

The preparations for war are being led by the American imperialists, and yet the leaders of the United States do not stop talking about their supposedly peaceful intentions. You see, they are not averse to "preserving" peace, but on "conditions" to be dictated by the United States. What are these "conditions"? The peoples of the world must kneel before American capital, renounce their national independence, accept the form of government that the American "advisers" will impose, introduce the "American way of life", develop those branches of the economy and only in those sizes that are pleasing and beneficial to the American monopolists (emphasis mine. - S.K.) ...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

I think, after reading the words highlighted above, the reader will understand why I singled them out. After all, what was exposed by L.P. Beria in 1951, became since 1991 in Russia the principle of the "policy" of the Kremlin, which turned into the Moscow branch of the "Washington Regional Committee of the Party"...

In short, the peoples must give up their political sovereignty and economic independence, their cultural and other interests, and become subjects of the newly minted American empire. And this is called "preserving the world"! ..

Every honest person has a legitimate question: on what basis does the United States claim an exclusive position among other countries? Maybe on the basis of the fact that they have a lot of gold acquired from the blood and suffering of millions and suitable for bribery? But peoples do not trade in freedom...

138

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

How disgusting against the background of these proud words is the current "policy" of the Kremlin, which sells not only the freedom of peoples, but also the historical future of its own people and other peoples of the world.

However, the people themselves look no less disgusting, allowing themselves to be traded and selling themselves. In, say, "independent" Ukraine, the walls are plastered with ads: "Zamizh beyond the cordon", and young Ukrainian women are increasingly sold - even if not to foreign brothels (although they are sold there too), but still they are sold.

In the Yeltsinoid "Rossiyanina", this has not yet become a phenomenon, but things are going the same way here.

"These gentlemen are talking about peace everywhere and at the same time preparing a new war, openly rattling their weapons and boastfully trumpeting some kind of "fantastic projectiles" (as we can see, the idea of "star wars" has a very long history. - S.K. .). Let them not think to intimidate anyone with this. As for the Soviet people, only people who have finally lost the ability to soberly

evaluate historical events, they may think that the Soviet people can be intimidated by threats. If up to now every military attack by imperialist states on our country has invariably ended in shameful failure, now our state is even stronger and more powerful, our people are even more united and confident in their own strength.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Exactly one month before Beria's report, on October 6, 1951, in the Saturday issue of Pravda, an extensive "Response of Comrade I.V. Stalin to a Pravda correspondent about atomic weapons. There were a lot of noisy comments after that in the world, and perhaps the best summary

139

made one of the mouthpieces of the American "hawks" - the weekly "Mem/z M/ek", publishing an article entitled "The Balance of Atomic Forces" ...

It was still far from equilibrium then, but by 1951 it certainly became easier to breathe. Although the Yankees were developing new plans for the atomic bombing of the USSR, they were already afraid of getting burned themselves.

The external unity of the imperialist front cannot hide its profound internal contradictions, connected mainly with the struggle for raw materials, markets, and spheres of investment of capital...

There can hardly be any doubt that the contradictions in the imperialist camp will deepen more and more.

An even more serious factor is the weakness of the rear of imperialism...

The weakness of the rear of imperialism is also expressed in the growth of the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. The people of Vietnam are heroically fighting for their liberation, the peoples of the Philippines, Burma and Malaya are fighting, the people of Indonesia have not laid down their arms, the resistance to imperialism is growing in the countries of the Near and Middle East, in the countries of North and South Africa.

The economies of the leading imperialist countries are also under the constant threat of shocks...

This is what the camp of imperialism and war looks like...

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Further, in the report to America and the West, an imminent "economic collapse" was predicted. Of course, this was too much, as was the calculation that the struggle for raw materials, markets and areas of capital investment could exacerbate

140

internal contradictions of imperialism almost to the point of direct conflict. Here Beria was influenced by Stalin's erroneous calculations, but ...

But even here it is not so simple!

Some modern historians blame Stalin for allegedly relying too much on the growth of internal contradictions of imperialism, but allegedly did not catch the harbinger of a new scientific and technological revolution, which just removed many contradictions and made it possible to globalize the economy.

However, Stalin's critics are not very right. Both Stalin and Beria did not expect that imperialism would penetrate so deeply into the structure of Soviet society in the form of various agents of influence.

They could not imagine the scale of the betrayal of the ideas of socialism by the leading strata of the USSR, which would begin to become a fact from the end of the 1950s. More precisely, Stalin and Beria saw the danger, but the Soviet subversive centers of the West managed to play "ahead of the curve."

If not for this, if the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries took on a socialist character, which was not impossible with Stalin and Beria alive and after 1953, then in the next not two or three years, but in Over the next two or three decades, the economic collapse of the West could become a fact.

We see a different situation in the camp of democracy and peace. The forces of this camp, free from internal contradictions, are growing and getting stronger every day.

<...>

Unlike the countries of the imperialist camp, which are and cannot help but be engaged in fierce mutual competition, the countries of the democratic camp are developing their economies on the basis of close

cooperation and mutual assistance. <...>

141

well well

Comrades! On the occasion of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, our country took a new step towards communism... In the struggle for the implementation of the majestic program of communist construction, the Soviet people rallied even more closely around their own Communist Party, around the inspirer and organizer of our victories, the great Stalin .

Conscious of their strength and the correctness of their path, the Soviet people, with unshakable calmness and faith in the future, continue their great creative work. No force in the world can delay the victorious advance of the Soviet people towards the final triumph of communism.

Long live the great, invincible banner of the October Socialist Revolution!

Long live our mighty Motherland, the indestructible bulwark of freedom and peace!

Long live the Lenin-Stalin Party, our glorious Bolshevik Party!

For the victory of peace and democracy throughout the world!

Pravda, No. 311 of November 7, 1951, pp. 2-4

From the compiler and commentator:

In my opinion, the report of L.P. Beria, with an abbreviated version of which the reader got acquainted, is very interesting. At that time, many verbal constructions were quite new and had quite a business content.

It was only later - through the efforts of various kinds of Adjubeys, barge haulers and Mlechins - that the right concepts and thoughts acquired a state-of-the-art oak look, and it was the Khrushchev-Brezhnev "speechwriters" that emasculated them and turned them into an empty phrase.

142

But for L.P. Beria, what he said on the eve of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was by no means an ordinary verbiage. Wherein

It should not be forgotten that, in fact, for the first time he addressed the people with a large responsible report at one of the highest public meetings in the country.

And in this report there were quite a few passages that should have been thought about then, and it doesn't hurt to think even today.

SPEECH AT THE 19TH CONGRESS OF THE AUCP(B)-CPSU October 7, 1952

From the compiler and commentator:

Speech by L.P. Beria, pronounced by him on October 7, 1952 at the 19th Congress, the Publishing House of Political Literature (Politizdat) still managed to publish in 1953 a separate brochure. A few months later, Beria's report fell into the category of banned books, and it is interesting, in my opinion, in all its parts. Therefore, I bring it here without any cuts - in full.

By the way, even such a detractor and hater of the USSR, Stalin and Beria as the renegade Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov, who fled to the Germans during the war and was warned by the Americans after the war, assessed Beria's speech as the only living speech at the congress.

In his report, Beria correctly singled out two systemically most important — by that time — events in the life of the Soviet Union: the war and the post-war boom. It was possible to look at our history in this way only by deeply comprehending it precisely from the standpoint of system analysis.

The war became a test of the strength of the Soviet social order. Young socialism passed this test.

The post-war restoration and development of the national economy became a test of the creative potential of the new system. And Beria convincingly, with figures, showed that this potential, in principle, is almost limitless - if you work smart and honestly to realize it.

144

A little later, in the afterword, I will once again dwell on the assessment below of Beria's speech, and now I will say that Beria showed the powerful potential for the development of a socialist society through the prism of the development in the conditions of the USSR of the former national outskirts of the Russian Empire. And he showed this, as a rule, in comparison with neighboring foreign countries.

This approach—to show the possibilities of socialism in terms of the development of previously backward peoples into socialist nations—was interesting in all respects, both practical and theoretical. Moreover, for a representative of one of the small nations of the USSR, such an approach was not only natural, but also politically smart and accurate.

Yes, Beria brilliantly chose one of the main topics of his report—the development of the socialist nations. If a Great Russian were talking about this topic, then someone might think to himself: they say, once again, the “Nationals” are being poked in the nose with the fact that without Russians they would still be slurping kharcho dudes.

But when one of the “nationals” who had worked a lot in the national republics of Transcaucasia spoke about the achievements of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy from the rostrum of the congress, this did not sound convincing.

I will draw the reader's attention to this, perhaps not immediately noticeable detail. For Beria, the former leader and outstanding reformer of Georgia, it would be very tempting to include extensive data on the Georgian SSR among the examples. This would be quite justified for the Georgian Beria, especially considering that it was the Georgian SSR that had the best development indicators compared to pre-revolutionary times in almost all areas of public life.

However, Beria spoke over and over again about Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan and almost never mentioned his native Georgia, noting only in a general enumeration that the population of Georgia is now provided with medical care to a much greater extent than the population of any country in the world.

145

This, of course, proves the high human and political tact of Beria. If he had focused on the Georgian SSR (and its "numbers" were worth it), then this could be regarded as his hint at his own merits, as a boast. But Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria did not sin with this.

Reproducing Beria's speech in full below, I immediately warn the reader that I am limiting myself to this introductory commentary for reasons of the most complete perception of Beria's thoughts and style.

So, the speech of L.P. Beria at the 20th Congress of the CPSU(b)-CPSU...

Comrades!

In the report of the Central Committee, made by Comrade Malenkov, the results of our party's activity during the period from the 11th to the 19th Congress were summed up. Two events occupy a special place in the life of our Party and the Soviet people during this period, on which I would like to dwell.

The first of these is the Great Patriotic War.

In this war, the question of the fate of our Motherland and the fate of the states and peoples of Europe and Asia was decided. It is clear to everyone that if the Hitlerite coalition had won, this would have led to monstrous enslavement and extermination of the peoples of our country and the peoples of many other countries. Hundreds of millions of people would be reduced to the position of slaves. The fascist barbarians would have destroyed modern civilization and set back all of humanity for many decades.

And if this did not happen, then first of all because the peoples of the Soviet Union achieved complete victory in a deadly battle with the fascist invaders. The suddenness of the treacherous attack on the USSR created favorable conditions for the Nazi troops at the first stage of the war. However, the Council

146

At the cost of enormous sacrifices, at the cost of the greatest exertion of all the material and spiritual forces of the people, the Union defended its independence, utterly defeated the enemy, who terrified the armies of Europe, and saved mankind and its civilization.

The inspirer and organizer of the great victory of the Soviet people was the Communist Party, led by Comrade Stalin. (Prolonged applause.) From the first days of the war, when our Motherland found itself in a particularly difficult situation, Comrade Stalin headed the State Defense Committee and the Armed Forces of the country. With great courage, our wise and fearless leader led the Soviet Army and the entire Soviet people through the fire of battles, hardships and trials of war to win victory over the enemy. It is a great happiness for our Party, for all the peoples of the USSR, that in this difficult period Comrade Stalin stood at the head of the Soviet state and its army. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

The victory of the Soviet people has shown the whole world that the strength and might of our socialist state is invincible.

This is one of the most important lessons of the Great Patriotic War. True, the lessons of history did not go to everyone for the future. The American imperialists, fattened by two world wars, intoxicated by the delusional idea of establishing their world domination, are once again pushing the peoples into the abyss of a world WAR.

The current bosses of the United States of America, the Morgans, Rockefellers, Mellons, DuPonts and others, in whose hands the levers of the American state and military machine are located, are intensively creating new world monopolies

147

de European Coal and Steel Community, the World Oil Cartel in order to quickly take over the economy of other states and subordinate it to their own interests. They want to establish their undivided dominance in all parts of the world in order to secure superprofits by robbing and enslaving the peoples of other countries. For this they need a war. In order to prepare for war, big American capital, together with the American military, assumes all the functions of the fascist regime in order to suppress in their country the desire of the people to preserve peace and any opposition to their adventurist policy. Pushing the country onto the path of war, they also expect that the arms race and the military situation will prevent an economic crisis. But this crisis is inevitably approaching the economy of the United States of America, and no tricks and adventures of financial tycoons will be able to avoid it. By accelerating the arms race, by adapting their entire economy to the aims of preparing for war, they fear peace more than war, although there is no doubt that by unleashing a war they will only hasten their collapse and their ruin. (And applause.)

Spreading a network of military bases all over the world, intensively forging all kinds of aggressive military blocs, they are feverishly preparing a war against the USSR and other peace-loving states. They are constantly sending spies and saboteurs into our country and other peace-loving countries, selected all over the world from the corrupted scum of mankind. The vigilance of the Soviet people is the sharpest weapon in the fight against enemy spies, and there is no doubt that, by raising and honing their

148

vigilance, the Soviet people will be able to neutralize the agents of the imperialist warmongers, no matter how much they send them in and no matter how they disguise them. Applause.)

Defiantly brazen provocations and adventures of the American military against the USSR in the form of numerous maneuvers of ground, air and naval forces, "inspection" trips of the military bosses of the Atlantic bloc to areas bordering the Soviet Union, the activity of American military aviation near the western and eastern borders of the USSR—all this, obviously, is intended to disturb the peace of the Soviet people and to support the military psychosis among themselves and their vassals.

Only hopeless fools can expect that provocations can frighten the Soviet people. (Prolonged applause.) The Soviet people know the value of all provocations and threats of warmongers. With unshakable calmness, the Soviet people continue their creative peaceful work. He is confident in the strength and power of his state and his army, capable of inflicting a crushing blow on those who dare to attack our Motherland and forever discourage encroachment on the borders of the Soviet Union. (Stormy applause.)

Another great event in the life of the Party and the Soviet people is the powerful new upswing of the national economy, which has made it possible to raise the level of our industry by 2.3 times in comparison with pre-war times and to take a big step on the road from socialism to communism. The war imposed on us by Hitler's fascism, the most cruel and difficult of all wars ever experienced by our Motherland, interrupted our peaceful



149

development. Hitler's monsters, carrying out the barbaric tactics of "scorched earth" in the areas they occupied, inflicted severe wounds on the Soviet national economy.

Under these conditions, with the end of the war, we faced the most difficult task of establishing life in the areas affected by the German occupation, restoring the pre-war level of industry and agriculture, and then surpassing this level to a more or less significant extent.

During this difficult period, Comrade Stalin gave us a detailed program for the restoration of the national economy and showed us the ways to carry it out. Comrade Stalin, with his indomitable will and energy, directly directed all the work of the party and the state in organizing the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the intelligentsia for the fulfillment of the post-war five-year plan. As is known, the post-war five-year plan was carried out successfully. (Applause...)

At present, industry, agriculture and transport in our country are developing on the basis of the most advanced technology and are ensuring an increase in all social production on an unprecedented scale.

In order to visualize the scale of our industrial production, I will give some examples.

If we compare the volume of industrial output produced in the last two years with the output of industrial output for all the years of the first and second five-year plans, it turns out that in 1951 and 1952 industrial output will be 22 per cent higher than in the two five-year plans. taken together. (Applause.) And in 1952 alone, such important

150

much more industrial products, such as electric power, ferrous metals, coal, oil products, cement, and consumer goods, will be produced than in all the years of the first five-year plan.

As for mechanical engineering, which is the basis of the technical progress of the entire national economy, it is developing at an even faster pace. In the current year alone, much more machines and equipment are produced than in the first and second five-year plans, taken together.

taken.

With the growth of socialist production, the well-being of the entire Soviet people is constantly growing and improving from year to year.

Economically and politically, and also in terms of its defense capability, the Soviet Union is now stronger than ever, and more than ever able to withstand any test. (Prolonged applause.)

If the enemy dares to go to war against us, then the Soviet Union, which is at the head of the camp of peace and democracy, will be able to give a crushing rebuff to any grouping of aggressive imperialist states, will be able to crush and punish the presumptuous aggressors and warmongers. (And applause.)

Comrades! One of the decisive conditions for achieving the victories won by the Soviet people both in the war and in peaceful economic and cultural construction was the wise and far-sighted national policy of our Party. More than 60 nations, national groups and nationalities live and work in the Soviet multinational state. Under these conditions, the conduct of a correct national policy acquires an exceptional

151

importance for the success of our common cause—strengthening the might of the USSR and building a communist society.

The national policy of our party is based on a coherent, scientifically substantiated theory of the national question, as part of Lenin's teaching on the proletarian revolution. The creators of the program and policy of the Communist Party in the national question are Lenin and Stalin. That is why they call our national policy Leninist-Stalinist. The national policy of our Party is warmly approved and unanimously supported by the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Lenin and Stalin directly supervised the creation of the Soviet multinational state. After the death of the great Lenin, Comrade Stalin directed all the work of the Party in establishing fraternal cooperation among the peoples of our country, in strengthening the Union of Republics, in developing the economy and culture of our peoples. Comrade Stalin has an exceptional role in developing the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the national question. He enriched Marxism-Leninism with the theory of the nation, developed Lenin's teaching on the unity of national and international tasks of the working class, on the strategy and tactics of the national liberation movement in the era of imperialism, developed the theoretical foundations of the national policy of the Communist Party in the conditions of the Soviet multinational states, created the doctrine of socialist nations and their development in the struggle for the victory of communism.

The Great October Revolution, which overthrew capitalism, liberated the peoples of Russia, abolished national oppression and led the peoples to a genuine rebirth. After the liquidation of the

152

Joisie with its nationalist parties and the establishment of the Soviet system in our country, on the basis of the old, bourgeois nations, new, socialist nations arose, developed and took shape. nation.

As a result of the consistent implementation of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy in our country, the actual inequality in economic and cultural development inherited from tsarism between the peoples of Central Russia and the peoples of the border regions that lagged behind them in the past has been eliminated. Now we have no more backward peoples. The new, socialist nations in our country during the years of socialist construction have radically changed their appearance and developed into advanced modern nations.

What does the concept of an advanced socialist nation include?

Proceeding from the classical definition of a nation given by Comrade Stalin, his doctrine of new, socialist nations, and proceeding from the historical experience of our Soviet multinational state, we can say that the main features inherent in an advanced socialist nation are the following.

First, the presence of the most advanced social and state system in the world, in which there are no exploiting classes and all power belongs to the people.

Secondly, the existence of a highly developed socialist industry and large-scale socialist agriculture.

Thirdly, universal literacy of the population, compulsory education of children, a developed system of higher education that provides training of national specialists for all areas

153

those economy and culture; prosperity of science and art.

Fourth, a systematic increase in the standard of living of the entire population by ensuring the growth of the real wages of workers and employees and the incomes of peasants, through the development of trade, the growth of cities and their improvement, and the improvement of living conditions; the presence of a wide network of medical institutions that ensure the protection of the health of the people.

Fifthly, the triumph of the ideology of equality of all races and nations, the ideology of friendship between peoples.

Do these features of an advanced socialist nation exist in our Soviet republics? Yes, there are. Let's turn to the facts.

It is known that tsarism acted as the oppressor and executioner of the peoples of Russia. Numerous non-Russian nations were completely disenfranchised. They did not have their own statehood, they were ruled by tsarist officials, in all institutions business was conducted in Russian, incomprehensible to the local peoples.

Under the conditions of the Soviet system, all the peoples of our country acquired and developed their own statehood. The national outskirts of tsarist Russia under Soviet rule were transformed from colonies and semi-colonies into truly independent states—Soviet republics, which had their own territory, national autonomy, their own constitution, their own legislation. In the authorities, in the economic and administrative authorities, in the judiciary of the union and autonomous republics, national regions, districts, districts and villages, people elected by the people, who know the life, customs and psychology of the local population, administer the state

154

military affairs in their native language, understandable to the entire population.

There is no such genuine equality of nations in any bourgeois state. Yes, it is understandable, because the elimination of national oppression is impossible within the framework of the capitalist system. As is known, the entire system of state administration in bourgeois countries is built on the inequality of races and nations, on racial discrimination, on the use of nationalist prejudices to incite ethnic hatred and enmity. In our time, two states, the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, are particularly rampant with racial and national discrimination.

The Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union, consistently pursuing the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, along with the high level of development of the entire national economy of the USSR, ensured the more rapid development of the economically backward national republics. As a result, the economic and cultural inequality inherited from the past between the peoples of the USSR has been eliminated, which, of course, is one of the most important achievements of the national policy of Soviet power.

Much convincing evidence could be cited about the successes in the development of the Soviet national republics, but I will confine myself to a few examples.

In the Soviet republics, during the period of the Stalinist five-year plans, the metallurgical, oil and chemical industries were recreated, large power plants, factories for the production of agricultural machines, tractors and automobiles, cement plants, large textile and

155

food processing plants and many other industrial enterprises.

That the industry of the national republics, and especially large-scale industry, developed faster than in the USSR as a whole, can be seen from the example of the Soviet republics of the East—Uzbek, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen, and Tajik. Products of large

In the period from 1928 to 1951, the industry of these republics grew 22 times, while in the USSR as a whole it grew 16 times over the same period.

It is known that in the recent past the eastern outskirts of tsarist Russia hardly differed in terms of the level of industrial development from their neighbors such as Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan. During the years of Soviet power, our Central Asian republics in industrial development quickly overtook the eastern countries bordering the USSR and went far ahead. If we compare the named Soviet republics with a number of countries of the East in terms of such an important indicator of the level of industrial development as the electric power industry, we will see that in five Soviet republics - Uzbek, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen and Tajik, with a population of about 17 million. people generate electricity three times more than in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Egypt, Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan combined, with their population of 156 million people. (Applause.) And if one Soviet republic, for example, Azerbaijan, is compared with Turkey in terms of electricity generation, it turns out that in Soviet Azerbaijan, which has a population almost seven times smaller, four times more electricity is generated. than in Turkey, which got into the noose of American "aid". (Animation in the hall. Laughter.)

156

Our Soviet republics have far outstripped in their development even the old industrial countries of Western Europe.

Let us compare, for example, one Soviet republic—the Ukrainian—with two large European bourgeois countries—France and Italy. Of course, in this case, not everything can be compared. It is known that in the Ukrainian SSR the exploiting classes have long been liquidated, the factories, the land and all the products of labor are the property of the people, unemployment has been abolished forever, all power belongs undividedly to the people. In this respect, both France and Italy, where the capitalists are in power, were left far behind by Soviet Ukraine more than thirty years ago. (Animation in the hall.) Therefore, let us compare only some of the most important data on the economies of these countries.

Soviet Ukraine, which during its existence twice had to rise from the ruins and ashes after the invasions of foreign invaders, now smelts much more iron than France and Italy combined (applause), produces more steel and rolled metal than France, and more than three times more than Italy; produces coal one and a half times more than France and Italy together; produces tractors in terms of power almost three times more than they are produced together by France and Italy; produces significantly more grains, potatoes, sugar beets and sugar than France and Italy combined.

On the basis of the rise of socialist industry and collective-farm agriculture, the Ukrainian people live a prosperous life and enjoy all the benefits of culture, which the working masses of France and Italy are deprived of.

157

No less indicative is the example of the rapid economic development of the Soviet Baltic republics after they established the Soviet system. If we compare the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian union republics with Norway, Holland and Belgium, it turns out that in the Soviet republics the rate of development of industry is incomparably higher than in the aforementioned capitalist states of Europe.

By the beginning of 1952, the Lithuanian SSR had surpassed the pre-war level of industrial production by 2.4 times, the Latvian SSR by 3.6 times and the Estonian by 4.1 times, while Norway, Holland and Belgium by that time had only slightly exceeded the pre-war level. - the level of industrial production, although the Soviet republics emerged from the war with a much more destroyed economy.

It is interesting to note that in the old, capitalist Latvia, even according to the embellished data of its then rulers, industrial production from 1913 to 1939, that is, in 26 years, increased one and a half times, and in the new, Soviet Latvia, in 11 years - from 1940 to 1951 - industrial production, despite the destruction caused by the war and enemy occupation, increased by 3.6 times.

Similar significant progress has been made in the area of agricultural development.

With the victory of the collective-farm system in the USSR, the agriculture of the Soviet republics embarked firmly on the path of uninterrupted progress. The collective-farm system was one of the greatest achievements of Soviet power, for it attached the peasant masses to the building of socialism, opened up new, hitherto unheard-of opportunities for the development of all branches of agricultural production, and created the conditions for

158

permanent improvement of the material and cultural standard of living of millions of peasants.

As a result, in all the Soviet republics we now have large-scale, highly marketable socialist agriculture with extensive use of the latest achievements of agronomic science and better equipped with modern technology than in any other country.

This can be seen in every republic of the Soviet Union. But I will dwell again on the Soviet republics of the East, where, as is known, before Soviet power, agriculture was the most backward, where there was not a trace of any agricultural machines, even the simplest ones.

At present, 121,000 tractors converted to 15-horsepower, 23,000 combines, 102,000 machines for sowing, processing and harvesting cotton, and hundreds of thousands of other agricultural machines and tools. In terms of the technical equipment of agriculture, the Soviet republics of the East are considerably superior to the most developed capitalist countries of Europe. (Applause...)

Take, for example, the availability of tractors. In Soviet Uzbekistan, there are 14 tractors for every thousand hectares of sown area, while in France there are 7 tractors for the same area, and in Italy 4 tractors of much lower power. Needless to say, there are an insignificant number of tractors in foreign countries of the East. If in the Uzbek SSR there is one tractor per 70 hectares of sowing, then in Nakista there are more than one tractor per 9,000 hectares, in India — for 13,000 hectares, in Iran — for 18,000 hectares of sowing.

159

Equipping socialist agriculture with a large number of machines radically facilitated the work of the peasants and, in combination with modern agricultural technology and the extensive development of irrigation, ensured high yields.

Let us take, for example, cotton, one of the leading industrial crops in the developed diversified agriculture of the Soviet republics of the East. The yield of raw cotton in 1951 in these republics averaged 21 centners per hectare.

In no country in the world that produces cotton, there is such a yield as the Soviet cotton growers have achieved. In the same 1951, the cotton yield in Egypt was 11.5 centners per hectare, in the USA - 8.3, in India - 3.4, in Pakistan - 5.2, in Turkey - 7.2, in Iran - 4.5 centners per hectare.

It should be taken into account that high cotton yields in the Soviet republics of the East were obtained over large areas, as evidenced by the fact that the above-mentioned Soviet republics

produce as much cotton as India, Egypt, Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan put together. (Applause.)

These are some of the facts about the economic development of the national republics that make up the USSR. They say that the economy of these republics is constantly growing and developing, not knowing crises and recession. Finally, these facts testify to what can be achieved by the peoples who have broken with imperialism and freed themselves from the domination of the landowners and capitalists. (And applause.)

In order to create a developed socialist economy in the Soviet national republics, it was necessary to put an end to the cultural backwardness of most of the republics, to develop cultural construction with might and main, to create a wide network of

160

primary and secondary schools in the native language, reorganize the system of higher education, and organize on a large scale the training of skilled workers, engineers and technicians, agronomists and livestock specialists, teachers and doctors from indigenous nationalities.

As a result of the implementation of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, the peoples of the Soviet Union carried out a genuine cultural revolution.

To date, more than 2 million engineering and technical workers are working in the Soviet republics in industry, construction, and transport; about 400 thousand agronomists, livestock specialists, foresters and other specialists are employed in agriculture; almost 2 million teachers and teachers work in schools, technical schools and higher educational institutions; almost 300,000 doctors and 900,000 paramedics, nurses and other paramedical personnel work in medical institutions in cities and rural areas. Each Soviet republic now has dozens of specialists with higher education.

thousand

A large network of higher educational institutions and technical schools has been set up in the Soviet republics to train cadres of the Soviet intelligentsia from indigenous nationalities. By the time Soviet power was established, there were 96 higher educational institutions in our country, with a few exceptions, located in the most important centers of Russia. 117 thousand people studied in these educational institutions.

At present there are 887 higher educational institutions in the USSR, with 1,400,000 students studying in them. There are 216 thousand students studying in Ukraine, in the Soviet republics of the Middle

161

Asia - 104 thousand, in the republics of Transcaucasia - 80 thousand, in Belarus - 35 thousand, in the Baltic Soviet republics - 37 thousand students.

In terms of the degree of development of higher education, the Soviet republics were far ahead of not only the foreign countries of the East, but also the countries of Western Europe.

For example, in the Tajik SSR, 58 people study in higher educational institutions per 10,000 people, in the Turkmen SSR - 60, in the Kirghiz - 64, in the Uzbek - 71, Azerbaijan - 93 people. While in Iran there are 3 students per 10 thousand people in higher educational institutions, in India - 9, Egypt and Turkey - 12, Sweden - 21, Italy - 32, in Denmark - 34, in France - 36 people. . During the Soviet era, 48 nationalities created their own written language and publish textbooks, books, and newspapers in their native language. Over the past 30 years, about 90,000 well-appointed and well-equipped schools have been built in the republics of the Soviet Union, almost two-thirds of them in the national union and autonomous republics.

With the growth of the socialist economy, the level of well-being of the population of the Soviet Union is rising from year to year. In all the Soviet republics, the real wages of workers and employees rose significantly, and the incomes of the peasants increased considerably. During the period from 1940 to 1951, the total income of workers and employees and the income of peasants increased by 78 percent.

The Soviet state shows great concern for protecting the health of the peoples of our country. Indicative in this regard is the availability of medical care to the population. I will bring

162

a few examples from individual Soviet republics.

Before the establishment of Soviet power in Uzbekistan, there was one doctor per 31,000 people. There is now one doctor for about the same population in Pakistan. At present, in the Uzbek SSR, there is one doctor for every 895 people. The Uzbek SSR is incomparably better provided with doctors than, for example, Egypt, where there is one doctor for every 4,350 people, and better than such countries of Western Europe as France, where there is one doctor for every 1,000 people, or Holland, where one doctor accounts for 1160 people

population.

In the Azerbaijan SSR, there is one doctor for every 490 people. The population of Soviet Azerbaijan is provided with medical assistance eight and a half times better than the population of Turkey, and 23 times better than the population of Iran. As for the Georgian SSR, where there is one doctor per 373 people, and the Armenian SSR, where there is one doctor per 483 people, the population of these republics is provided with medical care to a much greater extent than the population of any country. peace. But the point is not only that the population of the Soviet republics is provided with a large number of doctors. To complete the picture, it must be borne in mind that in the Soviet Union all types of medical care are provided to the population free of charge, and millions of working people use the best sanatoriums and rest homes every year, while in bourgeois countries medical care is provided mainly for a fee, and very much at that. high, and therefore it is inaccessible to the broad masses of working people, and the use of resorts

163

and sanatoriums there is the exclusive privilege of parasite exploiters.

The development of the socialist nations under the conditions of the Soviet social and state system, the elimination of actual economic and cultural inequality between nations, the long cooperation of the nations both in the defense of the Soviet state from external enemies and in the cause of socialist construction led to the establishment and complete the triumph in our country of the ideology of the equality of nations, the ideology of friendship between peoples.

Friendship between the peoples of our country has gone through many trials. The war against the Hitlerite coalition was one of the most serious tests of the durability of the friendship of peoples.

After the Great Patriotic War, friendship between the peoples of our country manifested itself with renewed vigor during the period of restoration of the socialist economy in the territory subjected to enemy occupation. In the restoration of the economy of the republics and regions. occupied, all the peoples of the Soviet Union took an ardent part, because they considered it their vital business and an urgent national task. Where, in what bourgeois state, is it seen that peoples give each other such help?

Now that the gradual transition from socialism to communism is being carried out in the USSR, the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union is being enriched in its development with new content. Reached

By the Soviet republics, the high level of economy and culture opened up opportunities for their even more active participation in solving the most important all-Union tasks.

164

The force that cements the friendship of the peoples of our country is the Russian people, the Russian nation, as the most prominent of all the nations that make up the Soviet Union. (Stormy applause.)

The Russian working class, under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, accomplished in October 1917 the greatest historical feat - it broke through the front of world imperialism, destroyed the power of the bourgeoisie and broke the chains of national-colonial oppression on one-sixth of the globe. There is no doubt that without the help of the Russian working class the peoples of our country would not have been able to defend themselves against the White Guards and interventionists and build socialism. As for the peoples who did not go through capitalist development in the past, without the long-term and systematic help of the Russian working class they would not have been able to make the transition from pre-capitalist forms of economy to socialism.

During the Great Patriotic War, as Comrade Stalin said, the clear mind, steadfast character and patience inherent in the Russian people manifested themselves with particular force. The Russian people, by their heroism, bravery and courage, earned in this war general recognition as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country. (Prolonged applause.)

Following the example of the Russian people, together with them, shoulder to shoulder selflessly fought the enemy, all the peoples of our country, together with the Russian people, they were the creators of our victory over Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan. The peoples of our country have shown the whole world what a mighty and indestructible force the Council has

165

a socialist multinational state based on the Stalinist friendship of peoples.

Friendship between the peoples of our country is based on the commonality of their vital interests. The peoples of the Soviet Union are united by their desire and determination to defend their freedom, independence and a happy life acquired under the conditions of Soviet power from any and all enemies, united by a common struggle to build a communist society. The peoples of our country are well aware that united by unbreakable Stalinist friendship in a single Soviet state—the Union of Republics—they are invincible and can successfully build communism and defend their gains against any threat.

Our Party and Comrade Stalin personally are tirelessly concerned about the correct implementation of the Soviet nationality policy. In the struggle against the enemies of Leninism, the party defended the Leninist-Stalinist national policy and ensured the complete and final defeat of great-power chauvinism, bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois cosmopolitanism.

The great merit of the leader of our party, Comrade Stalin, is that by his wise leadership he ensured a genuine rebirth and an unprecedented rise in the physical and spiritual strength of all the peoples of our country (applause), rallied them with unbreakable fraternal friendship and directed their efforts towards a single great goal - towards strengthening the might of our Motherland and the victory of communism. (Prolonged applause.)

The successes achieved in the development of the socialist nations in the system of a single multinational Soviet state are of great international significance.

166



In our example, the working class of the capitalist countries sees the way to its deliverance from exploitation, from poverty and unemployment, from the growing threat of the establishment of fascism.

In our example, the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries see the path from oppression and lack of rights to freedom and independence, from interethnic hatred and enmity to fraternal friendship among peoples, from hunger and poverty to a prosperous life, from illiteracy and cultural backwardness to the prosperity of culture, science and art.

The entire course of history more and more confirms the words of the leader of our party, Comrade Stalin, that "...now things are moving towards the fact that socialism can serve (and is already beginning to serve!) For the many millions of the vast colonial states of imperialism, the banner of liberation" .

The ideas of freedom, national independence, the ideas of socialism have penetrated into the most remote corners of the enslaved countries.

The peoples fighting for their liberation know that the great camp of peace and democracy is on their side, that the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies stand up for the cause of peace, freedom, independence and genuine equality of all races and nations and that even the very existence of these states puts a bridle on the black forces of reaction, making it easier for the oppressed peoples to fight.

The ruling circles of the United States of America and other bourgeois states, in their impotence against the growing national liberation movement, cry out to the whole world that the struggle of the oppressed peoples against their enslavers is the result of Soviet propaganda in the East. Untask bourgeois politicians were answered

167

to this by Comrade Stalin many years ago. Comrade Stalin said:

"We are accused of carrying out propaganda in the East... We don't need propaganda in the East. It is worthwhile for any citizen of a dependent country or colony to come to the Soviet country and see how our people govern the country; governance of a great country, to make sure that this is the only country where the brotherhood of peoples is not a phrase, but a deed. We do not need any printed or oral propaganda if we have the fact of such propaganda by deed as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (Prolonged applause.)

The people's democratic countries, in building a new life for themselves, use the rich experience of building and strengthening the Soviet multinational state.

A new type of relationship has developed between democratic states, which has not yet been known in the history of mankind. The main feature of these relations is that they  
based:

on the complete and real equality of all peoples, large and small, on the preservation of all sovereign rights and independence of each state, on non-interference in the internal affairs of another state, in contrast to the imperialist policy of diktat and enslavement of peoples;

based on mutual respect for national interests, trust and friendship between peoples, in contrast to the policy of secret collusion, intrigue, overt or covert hostility pursued by the imperialist states.

states;

168

on close economic cooperation and mutual assistance, ensuring the most favorable conditions for economic development in full accordance with the national interests of each country, in contrast to the fierce competition for sources of raw materials and markets that reigns in the camp of imperialism;

on the common desire of democratic states to ensure peace, to restore and develop economic and cultural ties between all countries, regardless of their economic and social systems, in the interests of improving the lives of millions of people in all countries of the globe, in contrast to the imperialist policy of militarization of the economy, the preparation and unleashing of a new world war, the attack on the living standards of the working people.

A characteristic feature of the relations between nations and states that exist in the camp of imperialism is the greedy striving of American capital for world domination. American imperialism, which has spread its nets in all parts of the world, like an insatiable spider, is sucking the life juices out of many peoples and states, not disdaining any means to enslave them. The most common method is enslavement under the guise of so-called American "aid". Moreover, the country that received American "aid" loses its sovereign rights and independence in a short time and is reduced to the position of a vassal. The most that such a country can count on is the position of a partner that is by no means equal.

Such an unequal partner of the United States of America today is Great Britain, once known as the "mistress of the seas",

169

"workshop of the world". Every day American imperialism is pushing Britain more and more away from sources of raw materials and from markets, by all means driving her out of the countries of Europe and Asia, taking from her one position after another. Things went so far that the Americans unceremoniously refused the British government its most humble request to be allowed to send its observer to the US negotiations with the British dominions - New Zealand and Australia on the so-called Pacific Pact. In this connection, even the English conservative press has recently lamented bitterly that England is being treated like a poor relative (laughter, animation in the hall), who is lectured, bullied or ignored. And one of the conservative newspapers, the Daily Mail, stated bluntly: "If we lose our positions here and there, we will soon have nothing to lose." (Laughter in the hall.) One cannot think that the ruling circles of England do not understand this, but they still continue to obey the American dictatorship, trying to put on a good face with a bad game. (Animation in the hall.) The US imperialist bosses are turning the countries they have enslaved into springboards for an aggressive war, and the youth of these countries are doomed to the role of cannon fodder. Thus, from step to step, countries that have become dependent on the United States are sliding down the disastrous path of war. Striving to save capitalism wherever it is in danger, fighting to preserve colonial domination and the most reactionary regimes wherever they are threatened by the national liberation movement and democratic revolution, American imperialism has become the stronghold and citadel of world reaction. Headlong, he walks a hundred

170

the memory of German fascism, condemning their troops to the position of gendarmes and stranglers of freedom-loving peoples. It is quite natural that the peoples of countries that have become dependent on the United States are organizing on a national scale to resist American interference in their lives, to expel uninvited masters from their country, and pay them with burning hatred for mockery of national honor and dignity.

In turn, the American people, who are drummed into the idea of an allegedly existing external threat every day, are beginning to understand the absurdity of this propaganda. Under heavy

With the burden of increasing military spending, he is increasingly showing his dissatisfaction with the current policy of the ruling circles of the United States.

Comrades! The main result with which our Party arrived at the 19th Congress is that the Soviet Union has achieved unprecedented power and international prestige. We achieved this through the policy of industrialization, which transformed our country from an agrarian into an advanced industrial power, through the policy of collectivization, which turned our agriculture into a large-scale, mechanized, most advanced in the world, through the consistent implementation of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, which ensured the indestructible unity and friendship of the peoples of the USSR, through the steady implementation of the Stalinist foreign policy aimed at maintaining peace between peoples.

The well-being and culture of the peoples of our country have risen to a high level.

History shows that during the 35 years of Soviet power our country has achieved such industrial progress that capitalist

171

It took centuries for the skies to develop. If the USSR during the years of Soviet power increased its industrial production by 39 times, then England took 162 years to increase industrial production by the same number of times (from 1790 to 1951), and France over the past 90 years increased its industrial production. production is only 5.5 times. As for the United States of America, over the past 35 years they have increased their industrial output only 2.6 times.

The socialist state achieved its successes in a historically short period of time because the Soviet system opened hitherto unprecedented opportunities for the rapid economic and cultural development of the USSR, because the struggle of our people for socialism was led by the Communist Party, which knows where to do business, and is not afraid of difficulties. (Prolonged applause.)

The road to the victory of socialism in our country was not easy. On this path there were many difficulties and obstacles, both internal and external, but our Party was always in mobilization readiness and successfully overcame them. Now, when we are faced with great and complex tasks of communist construction, our Party, as the party leading the Soviet state, must foresee the difficulties and be fully equipped to lead the people to overcome them. We are confident that our party, created and educated by Lenin and Stalin, will always continue to rise to the height of its great tasks. (Applause...)

Together with the great Lenin, Comrade Stalin built and strengthened our party, led the working class of Russia to storm capitalism in October 1917, created the world's first Soviet state. Bo

172

More than a quarter of a century after the death of the great Lenin, Comrade Stalin has been leading our Party and the Soviet people along unexplored paths of building a new, communist life. At each new stage of this path, Comrade Stalin theoretically arms our Party, teaches it to foresee the further course of events and directs it towards the solution of the main tasks.

A great event in the ideological life of the Party is the further development of Marxist-Leninist theory by Comrade Stalin in his work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

The propositions and conclusions given by Comrade Stalin in this work are of particular importance because they open a new chapter in the development of Marxist-Leninist science and are inextricably linked with the main tasks of the practice of communist construction in the USSR. It is known

that Marx and Engels turned socialism from a utopia into a science. Developing Marxism, the great Lenin created the doctrine of the socialist state and the ways of building a classless socialist society in our country. By putting this doctrine into practice, the Party, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, achieved a world-historic victory: socialism turned from a dream of the best minds of mankind into reality. The Soviet people built socialism, and our country entered a period of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Under these conditions, new questions of Marxist-Leninist theory arose before our Party. What preconditions must be created for the transition from socialism to communism to take place? What needs to be done for this? What are the main patterns of this important historical period? And we see how Comrade Stalin

173

He gave clear and precise answers to all these urgent, vital questions of the movement of our Soviet society, which illuminated the path ahead for the Party and the Soviet people.

There is no doubt that Comrade Stalin's instructions on the conditions and ways of bringing about a gradual transition from socialism to communism will be accepted by our congress and our entire party as their program of struggle for the building of communism. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

Our Party and the entire Soviet people greeted this Stalinist program with the greatest enthusiasm. It inspires the best dreams of the Soviet people and inspires them to new heroic deeds in the name of the triumph of the great ideas of Lenin and Stalin. (Applause.)

Our victorious march towards communism will serve as an inexhaustible source of inspiration for the working class and working people of all countries in their revolutionary struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

In these historic days of the 19th Congress, the Soviet people, strong in their unity, are more united than ever around their native Communist Party and are ready for new labor exploits for the glory of their Fatherland. (Applause...)

The peoples of our country can be sure that the Communist Party, armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, will lead our country to the cherished goal of communism. (Stormy, long-lasting applause. Everyone rises.)

Beria L.P. Report at the XIX Congress of the CPSU (b) October 7, 1952. Gospolitizdat. 1953. - 30 p.

#### FUNERAL SPEECH AT I.V. STALIN MARCH 9, 1953

From the compiler and commentator:

At the funeral meeting on the occasion of the funeral of I.V. Stalin were V.M. Molotov, G.M. Malenkov and L.P. Beria.

I remind you that the analysis of L.P. I devoted a separate chapter to Beria in my book Why Stalin Was Killed. But there I gave only brief extracts from the speech, and over the decades a lot of lies have accumulated around it, including through the efforts of the good Soviet poet and writer Konstantin Simonov, as I regret to say. That is why I included in the last volume the materials of L.P. Beria, the full text of his funeral speech on March 9, 1953.

Dear comrades, friends!

It is difficult to express in words the feeling of great sorrow that our Party and the peoples of our country, all progressive mankind, are experiencing these days.

Stalin, the great comrade-in-arms and brilliant successor of Lenin's work, is no more. A man has left us, the closest and dearest to all Soviet people, to millions of working people all over the world.

The whole life and work of the Great Stalin is an inspiring example of fidelity to laziness, an example of selfless service to the

175

to the working class and the entire working people, to the cause of the liberation of the working people from oppression and exploitation.

The great Lenin founded our party, led it to the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Together with the Great Lenin, his brilliant colleague Stalin strengthened the Bolshevik Party and created the world's first socialist state.

After Lenin's death, Stalin led our party and country along the Leninist path for almost thirty years. Stalin defended Leninism from numerous enemies, developed and enriched Lenin's teaching in new historical conditions. The wise leadership of Great Stalin ensured for our people the building of socialism in the USSR and the world-historic victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War. The great architect of communism, the leader of genius, our dear Stalin armed our party and people with a majestic program for building communism.

Comrades! The pain in our hearts is unquenchable, the loss is incredibly heavy, but even under this weight the steel will of the Communist Party will not bend, its unity and firm determination in the struggle for communism will not waver.

Our Party, armed with the revolutionary theory of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, wise with half a century of experience in the struggle for the interests of the working class and all working people, knows how to conduct business in order to ensure the building of a communist society.

The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government went through the great school of Lenin and Stalin in leading the country.

In the fire of civil war and intervention, in the difficult years of the struggle against devastation and famine, in the struggle

176

not for the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture, in the difficult years of the Great Patriotic War, when the fate of our homeland and the fate of mankind were being decided, the Central Committee of the Party and the Soviet Government, heading and directing the struggle of the Soviet people, gained vast experience in leading the party and the country .

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

For the Burlatsky, Bovin and Mlechin, the enumeration of the last paragraph was just a set of words that had to be inserted into the next speech of this or that "leader" of the CPSU, but for Beria and the millions of those who listened to this speech, it was their life, their struggle and fate.

Therefore, the peoples of the Soviet Union can continue to rely with full confidence on the Communist Party, its Central Committee and their Soviet Government.

The enemies of the Soviet state are counting on the heavy loss we have suffered to lead to confusion and confusion in our ranks.

But their calculations are in vain: cruel disappointment awaits them.

Whoever is not blind sees that our Party, in difficult days for it, closes its ranks even more closely, that it is united and unshakable.

Anyone who is not blind sees that in these mournful days all the peoples of the Soviet Union, in fraternal unity with the great Russian people, have rallied even more closely around the Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

The Soviet people unanimously support both the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state.

177

Our domestic policy is based on the indestructible alliance between the working class and the collective farm peasantry, on the fraternal friendship between the peoples of our country, on the firm unification of all Soviet national republics in the system of a single great multinational state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This policy is aimed at further strengthening the economic and military might of our state, at the further development of the national economy and at the maximum satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of the entire Soviet society.

The workers, the collective farm peasantry, the intelligentsia of our country can work calmly and confidently, knowing that the Soviet Government will carefully and tirelessly protect their rights, written in the Stalinist Constitution.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

I am not inclined to often intrude into the text of this speech with comments, however, as I wrote earlier in the book "Why They Killed Stalin", this part of Lavrenty Pavlovich's speech had a special potential. Beria was now not only the First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Malenkov, but also again headed the united Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR. At the same time, Beria became the only one of the three speakers at the funeral rally who directly mentioned the Stalin Constitution and the rights guaranteed to her.

Subtle moment! The party "tops" and circles close to them knew that even before the very first elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1937, Stalin intended to ensure that the elections were alternative. And the mention of the Stalinist Constitution in Beria's speech could lead some to the idea that Beria would lead the line precisely in this direction. And this would be a deadly threat to the emerging partoplasm of a new generation.

178

Another interesting moment!

Four months after Stalin's death, at that July Plenum of the Central Committee, where the political execution of the already arrested Beria took place, Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan said (I quote from an uncorrected transcript):

"At first I told him why you need the NKVD (Mikoyan, out of old habit, said "NKVD", meaning the Ministry of Internal Affairs. - S.K.)? And he answered: it is necessary to restore the rule of law, such a situation in the country cannot be tolerated. We have a lot of arrested people, they need to be released. The NKVD should be reduced (under Minister Ignatiev, the staff was very swollen. - S.K.), the guards should be sent to Kolyma and one or two people should be left for protection (members of the government. - S.K. ..) ...

When he spoke on Red Square over the coffin of Comrade Stalin, after his speech I said: there is a place in your speech to guarantee (emphasis here and below mine. - S.K.) to every citizen the rights and freedoms provided for by the Constitution. This is not an empty phrase in the speech of a simple speaker, but in the speech of the Minister of the Interior it is a program of action, you must fulfill it. He answered me: I will fulfill it ... "

It is unlikely that this program could suit the partoplasm of all levels, starting with the same Khrushchev, who was inclined to act not by persuasion, but by his fist. Yes, and not only Khrushchev was the case! Think,

It is no coincidence that in the verbatim report on the Plenum, already corrected and intended for distribution, Mikoyan's words looked somewhat different: "... I told him: in your speech there is a place about guaranteeing every citizen the rights of personality granted to him by the Constitution ..."

The difference was, in fact, fundamental: guaranteed rights and granted rights are unequal things. Not to mention the notorious, so beloved by the "democrats", "the rights personalities."

Our foreign policy is clear and understandable. From the first days of Soviet power, Lenin defined the foreign policy of Soviet power as a policy

peace. 179

This policy of peace was steadily pursued by the great successor of Lenin's work, our wise leader Stalin.

And from now on, the foreign policy of the Soviet Government will be the Leninist-Stalinist policy of preserving and consolidating peace, fighting against the preparation and unleashing of a new war (Leonid Mlechin, ay! - S.K.), the policy of international cooperation and the development of business relations with all countries of the world on the basis of reciprocity.

The Soviet Government will further strengthen the fraternal alliance and friendship, cooperation in the common struggle for peace throughout the world, broad economic and cultural cooperation with the great People's Republic of China, with all the people's democracies and with the German Democratic Republic.

Our brothers and friends abroad can be sure that the Communist Party and the peoples of the Soviet Union, the faithful banners of proletarian internationalism, the banners of Lenin and Stalin, will further strengthen and develop friendly ties with the working people of the capitalist and colonial countries who are fighting for cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

Deep feelings of friendship unite our people with the heroic Korean people fighting for  
its independence.

Our great leaders Lenin and Stalin taught us to tirelessly increase and sharpen the vigilance of the Party and the people against the intrigues and intrigues of the enemies of the Soviet state.

Now we must increase our vigilance even more.

Let no one think that the enemies of the Soviet state will be able to take us by surprise.

180

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Oh, Lavrenty Pavlovich! You meant June 1941, but you did not expect that June 1953 would soon await you and the country.

To defend the Soviet Motherland, our valiant Armed Forces are equipped with all types of modern weapons. Our soldiers and sailors, officers and generals, enriched by the experience of the Great Patriotic War, will be able to properly meet any aggressor who dares to attack our country.

The strength and indestructibility of our state lies not only in the fact that it has an army seasoned in battles, fanned with glory. The might of the Soviet state lies in the unity of the Soviet people and in their confidence in the Communist Party, the leading force of Soviet society, in the people's confidence in their Soviet Government. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government highly value this confidence of the people.

The Soviet people met with unanimous approval the Resolution of the Central Committee of our Party, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on carrying out extremely important decisions aimed at ensuring uninterrupted and correct leadership of the entire life of the country.

One of these important decisions was the appointment of Georgy Maksimilianovich Malenkov, a talented student of Lenin and Stalin's faithful comrade-in-arms, to the post of Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The decisions taken by the highest party and state bodies of our country were

181

a striking expression of complete unity and solidarity in the leadership of the party and the state.

This unity and solidarity in the leadership of the country is the key to the successful implementation of the domestic and foreign policy worked out over the years by our Party and Government under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

The events of the next few months, and then the removal of Malenkov from the post of Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR in 1955 and the final removal of him, Molotov and Kaganovich from the leadership in June 1957, showed that it was not possible to ensure unity in the "tops". Khrushchev's villainy, the activities of agents of influence, and the selfish, petty ambitions of partoplasm played their sinister role here. However, for understanding the nature of Beria, it is important that he, realizing the danger of a split, immediately after Stalin's death called on his colleagues to work together. It is not his fault, but his misfortune that this call was in vain.

Stalin, like Lenin, left a great legacy to our party and country, which must be cherished like the apple of an eye and tirelessly multiplied.

The great Stalin brought up and rallied around himself a cohort of battle-tested leaders who mastered the Leninist-Stalinist skill of leadership, on whose shoulders fell the historical responsibility to bring to a victorious end the work begun by Lenin and successfully continued by Stalin.

The peoples of our country can be sure that the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union will not spare their strength and their lives in order to preserve the steely unity of the

182

of the Party and its leadership, strengthen the indestructible friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union, strengthen the might of the Soviet state, remain faithful to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and, following the precepts of Lenin and Stalin, lead the country of socialism to communism.

Eternal glory to our beloved, dear leader and teacher, the great Stalin.

#### AFTERWORD BY THE PUBLISTOR

I will start this afterword a little from afar and, as it may seem to someone, not quite on the topic. However, the connection below with what the reader read above, in my opinion, is undeniable. After all, some people still try to present Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria even today, if not as a half-wit with hands, knee-deep in blood, then, in any case, as an intellectually not very developed person who acted sometimes with a whip, sometimes with a carrot, but never by the force of a persuasive argument.



Slanderers of Beria, after reading this book, will again declare that Beria was not even close to being able to have a deep, original look at social processes, that his overall development was low, that Beria's reflections on the fate of socialism and the USSR are just new inventions of the Kremlin, etc.

So, I will give some evidence, which, I must say, was unexpected even for me, who had long been convinced of the high intellectual level of Lavrenty Pavlovich. And this evidence just proves that Beria had, in fact, a completely scientific mindset, which involves constant hard work of the mind of its owner and reflection on a very wide range of topics.

184

Not so long ago, in a conversation with one of my senior colleagues, a theoretical physicist at the Sarov Nuclear Weapons Center, I learned an interesting thing. We were talking about Beria, and suddenly my interlocutor said:

- Do you know how German Goncharov assessed Beria?

One of the oldest weapons physicists at the Sarov "Object" German Arsenievich Goncharov (1928–2009), Hero of Socialist Labor, laureate of the Lenin Prize, is no longer alive today. And the level of his merits is understandable by the awards and titles that he was awarded.

G.A. Goncharov entered nuclear weapons work at the USSR's main nuclear weapons center at Arzamas-16 (Sarov) in the early 1950s. The modern look of domestic nuclear charges was just beginning to take shape, and the latest developments of the gunsmith Goncharov are still in service today.

Since the second half of the 1990s, German Arsen'evich, together with retired colonel Pavel Petrovich Maksimenko, former long-term head of the representative office of the USSR Ministry of Defense at the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Experimental Physics in Arzamas-16, has been preparing for publication a multi-volume collection of documents "Soviet atomic project". The declassified documents were published in accordance with the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of February 17, 1995 No. 160 "On the preparation and publication of an official collection of archival documents on the history of the creation of nuclear weapons in the USSR".

German Goncharov was, I must say, a cautious person, prudent in terms of assessments, and although I often touched on the topic of Beria in conversations with him, he did not tell me what he said to his friend

those

185

oretic. So I asked with natural, lively interest:

- Well, in general, in conversations with me, Goncharov assessed the role of Beria as outstanding and positive, but what did he tell you?

"Well, here it is," my friend replied. - He said that after studying many thousands of documents with Beria's visas, after studying the transcripts of various meetings, etc. German came to the conclusion that Beria understood the technical issues of the atomic project at the level of a doctor of technical sciences!

- Is that what he said? I wondered.

- Exactly!

- Yes, but... But he didn't tell me, apparently, he was careful.

"Perhaps... He told me this shortly before his death," I heard in response.

Such an assessment from the lips of such a specialist as G.A. Goncharov, - this, you should note, is not a pound of raisins! .. Its weight and representativeness are beyond doubt.

However, this is an assessment in decades, and an assessment of a person whose opinion about Beria was formed according to documents. However, it is known that such an undeniably outstanding scientist as Pyotr Leonidovich Kapitsa, who treated Beria without much love and complained to Stalin about him in writing, noted Beria's sharp mind in the same letters and stated that he could make a good scientist.

But Beria, in his main professional specialization, was not a physicist, not an engineer, not a technologist, but a politician. But if he knew how to think, and to think big, to think like a scientist, in purely special spheres of human activity in the field of the atom, then all the more he could not help thinking about the political fate of the country, man

186

and the cause to which he dedicated his life.

Beria, as we see, was thinking. And as an analyst, and as a politician, and as a person. And not just as a person and politician, but as a Bolshevik politician.

In No. 20 of the all-Ukrainian weekly "I want to go to the USSR", which has been published in Mariupol (former Zhdanov) since 2011, I came across an article by Oleg Bobrakov "Meeting with Lavrentiy Beria", which describes, as the author, in 1952 — a little boy, along with his aunt, who had arrived from the Caucasus, ended up in the Kremlin - a guest of Beria. Bobrakov describes him as "an ordinary elderly, overweight, kind-looking uncle in a gray suit, wide trousers and a gray soft hat"...

And where did Lavrenty Pavlovich take his guests? To the Tsar Bell? To the Tsar Cannon? To the golden-domed Kremlin cathedrals?

No, he led the boy through the underpass to the sarcophagus with the body of Lenin. Bobrakov writes: "... This is Lenin, boy, remember it well," said "uncle" quietly, without removing his hand from my shoulder. We stood at the tomb of the leader, carefully peering into his features..."

And then they left the Mausoleum to the graves near the Kremlin wall.

Doesn't this small, but still historical detail once again prove that Beria was not just one of the leaders of the Communist Party (Juda Gorbachev was even the General Secretary in the CPSU), but was a convinced and active communist, Bolshevik.

Above, I already mentioned Colonel Pavel Petrovich Maksimenko... In my first book about Beria, I described a conversation with him, during which Pavel Petrovich said:

187

- When I started working with archival documents a few years ago, I was, of course, prejudiced towards Beria. But as I worked, my impression of him changed to the exact opposite.

- How about a person? I clarified.

- Yes, including as a person ...

That's what the real Beria was like. At the same time, the real Beria was, as we see, not only an outstanding practitioner, but also a far-sighted, thinking theorist of building socialism.

One more detail...

The German professor Nikolaus Riehl (born, by the way, in 1901 in St. Petersburg and deported to the USSR after the war) worked successfully in the Soviet Atomic Project for ten years, received the title of Hero of Socialist Labor under Stalin, became laureate of the Stalin Prize. In 1955 he left for Germany and there he wrote the book "Ten Years in the Golden

cage."

Riel, of course, was a major scientist, but he wrote a book, although damn interesting, but mean. It's good that he publicly admitted that the Soviet "cage" (for Riel it looked like a comfortable mansion) was "golden", not "iron".

So, Riel described his two meetings with Beria, and although the German professor did not avoid the usual set of clichés ("the notorious organizer of the NKVD work camps ...", "it was felt that everyone was trembling before Beria ...", etc. .), what he witnessed depicts Lavrenty Pavlovich as a person with a lively mind, with an undoubted sense of humor and with that relaxed behavior, which becomes the result of a lot of personal work on oneself to develop the mind and soul.

188

Riel wrote:

"Beria received us (in 1945. - S.K.) very kindly. His demeanor was charming. It is known that people of his warehouse can be very pleasant in a personal respect. Himmler was also a charming conversationalist."

I don't know how many times Riel met Himmler and whether he met him at all. But the fact that Ril, like this, with a tip, having met with Beria only twice (and both times Beria was friendly, attentive to the opinion of the interlocutor and caring), had the audacity to judge Beria at random, does not paint the German precisely like an intellectual. After all, Ril obviously did not have personal experimental, so to speak, material for a representative scientific judgment about Beria.

And here is the judge!

But let's take a look...

Beria was compared with Himmler not only by Riehl. Is such a comparison correct?

Himmler was the head of the department of death, and Beria, when he was People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR, was the head of the department, in whose activities creative work occupied a significant place. And no need to smirk — at the construction sites and enterprises of the GULAG of the NKVD of the USSR, many people worked sincerely, and a conscious policy of exhaustion and killing, in contrast to the concentration camps of the SS for Soviet prisoners of war, was not carried out.

At the same time, Himmler never engaged in the creative organization of the free life of many people, and Beria, heading the party organizations of Transcaucasia and Georgia, showed himself

outstanding

189

being a reformer. As for Georgia itself, during the leadership of Georgia from 1931 to 1938, Beria became perhaps the most powerful figure in purely Georgian history, creating a new socialist Georgia.

Most importantly, Beria was undoubtedly bright and diversely talented and intellectual. And genius and villainy are incompatible things, Pushkin was deeply right here! Himmler, on the other hand, was undoubtedly very ordinary and did not shine with outstanding intellect. So-so - the average European enthusiast,

due to organizational thoroughness, ascended much higher than he could claim, based on personal qualities.

During the war, Beria proved himself to be an outstanding organizer of the work of the Soviet rear, and in the spring of 1945 he met as Deputy Chairman of the State Defense Committee, becoming Marshal of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1945.

And completely defeated Himmler, dressed in the uniform of an army non-commissioned officer, was detained by an American patrol in 1945 and either he bit through the ampoule with poison, or was - in order to avoid unpleasant interrogations of the former Reichsfuehrer SS by Russian "allies" - the same Americans killed - him.

Beria, at a critical moment in the struggle for the Caucasus at the end of the summer of 1942, was sent there by Stalin as a plenipotentiary representative of the Headquarters of the Supreme High Command and the State Defense Committee and played an exceptionally important role in the defense of the Caucasus.

Himmler, appointed by Hitler at the end of the war as commander of the Vistula Army Group, showed himself to be a complete mediocrity and failed ingloriously.

Finally, let's figure out what would happen if Ril stayed in Russia (after all, he was her native),  
became

190

a professor at Moscow State University or Leningrad State University, was captured by the Germans and was introduced to Himmler in 1941? How would the head of the SS behave with the "Russian" Riel? What, would he be kind and considerate, even if he wanted Riehl to start working in the German Uranium Project?

Oh no! There is no doubt that even in this case Himmler would have been arrogant, arrogant and would have unequivocally made it clear to the "Russian" that he could count on life only if he faithfully served the Reich and the Fuhrer.

But Beria in 1945 - a victorious year for the USSR - was kind to Ril, spoke on an equal footing, joked cleverly, and there was no talk about any threats, about any requirements of the need to be faithful to the cause of communism and personally to Comrade Stalin.

Beria's intellectuality was fully manifested in his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU (b) - CPSU. He examined the problem of the formation and development of socialist nations very sensibly—with generalizations and at the same time concretely. These thoughts can be useful - as starting points - for the future of the Soviet Union, which was and can only be multinational.

At the same time, Beria showed a subtle understanding of national problems - after all, he himself was a representative of a non-titular nation and saw the problem from the inside. At the same time, Beria interpreted the problem in the way that a Bolshevik-Great Russian could and should have done. Like Stalin, Beria, being by birth a son of the Caucasus and remaining a son of the Caucasus until the end of his days, also became a profoundly Russian person in his worldview, fully assuming such outstanding features of the Russian national character as a broad outlook and the ability to scale thoughts and ideas.

191

Actually, that's why, I confess, unlike many, I approach the grammatical declension of the surname "Beria" with the norm for Russian, and not Georgian surnames. Similar Georgian surnames Kakuchaya, Sanaya, etc. really don't lean. But Slavic surnames like, for example, the Ukrainian surnames Bohun, Krichun, Brezkun, etc. they do not bow only in the feminine form, but in the masculine form they bow.

But as for the declension of the surname - this is so, by the way. But in essence, it can be added that Beria was the only one of the speakers who spoke directly and in detail in his report about the role and significance of the Russian people in that ensemble of nations that was the Soviet Union.

In his speech at the 19th Congress, Beria also revealed a deep understanding of the innovation and significance of Stalin's recent work, Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR. Much was said about this work in speeches at the congress, but almost all the speakers enthusiastically praised this work, calling it "brilliant" (which, in fact, it was!) without concrete confirmation of their opinion, and it all looked pretentious and unconvincing.

Beria, in the block of his speech where he spoke about "Economic problems ..", said intelligent words about Stalin's work and proving that he quite correctly understood the essence of Stalin's thoughts. Turning to Beria's speech, the reader can once again be convinced of this for himself.

Finally, I'll say this...

In the currently published undated records of the last years of L.P. Beria, as in other important documents of that era, reflects its fundamental problems, which in the USSR of Stalin and Beria

192

were successfully resolved and would have been resolved definitively, if not for the frenzied, albeit secret, activity of the external and internal enemies of Russia and socialism to protect the rotten privileges of the world private property elite.

This activity, as I have already written in my books "How the USSR is fucked up" and "Beria is not on you!", began even before the first working people's state in the world arose. This activity began, in fact, from the very moment when the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" was first published. Then the smart leaders of the ruling class immediately realized that if they allowed the proletarians to unite in order to gain political power, then, sooner or later, the parasitic privileges of the Golden Elite and the luxury that they used to surround themselves with would come to an end.

In the name of their selfish, exclusively selfish goals, this Elite corrupted and corrupts to this day the entire human society. Only one political force opposed this - the Bolsheviks of the Leninist-Stalinist formation, whose prominent representative was the reformer of Georgia, the outstanding People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR, the organizer of the military rear, the curator of the Atomic Problem of the USSR, the great socialist manager and Stalin's deputy Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria.

He dreamed of living "at least another 20 years", and if this dream of his - quite real, if not for the betrayal of his closest colleagues - came true, it is possible that Beria's old age would have fallen already in the era of powerful Soviet communism. Beria believed that communism was possible, and not only believed in it, but worked in the name of this goal and led the work of huge working masses.

193

Beria had many creative plans and ideas beneficial for the prosperity of the country and its peoples, but he was meanly killed at the age of only fifty-four years.

And he left a powerful mark in the history of the world.

And the more we move away from that era, the more clearly it manifests itself.

Application

SOME MATERIALS OF THE 19TH CONGRESS OF THE AUCP(B)-CPSU

From the Directives of the 19th Congress of the CPSU on the 5th Five-Year Development Plan

National Economy of the USSR for 1955-1959

From the compiler and commentator:

The content of the Directives of the 19th Congress for the next five-year period and their actual implementation is a very little-known and very curious "plot", and I will touch on it at least a little. Moreover, this "plot" is also related to the topic of L.P. Beria.

On October 9, 1952, at the 19th Congress of the CPSU, the Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR M.Z. Saburov.

On October 12, the congress approved these Directives.

Already by 1955, the overall level of industrial production should have increased by 70% compared to 1950.

The average annual growth rate of all gross output was determined at about 12 percent.

Below are some extracts from the report of M.Z. Saburova.

195

"..The basis for the growth of industry and the entire national economy is metallurgy ...

Refined copper production will be increased by about 90 percent; lead - 2.1 times; aluminum - not less than 2.6 times; zinc — 2.5 times; nickel - by 53 percent and tin by 80 percent ...

Oil production will increase by about 85 percent."

(Further powerful electrification was envisaged and the construction of the largest Kuibyshev, Stalingrad, Kakhovskaya hydroelectric power stations, and in addition - Kamskaya, Gorkovskaya, Mingechaurskaya, Ust-Kamenogorsk hydroelectric power stations, was planned for the five-year period.

Mechanical engineering, shipbuilding, machine tool building, timber and wood chemical industries, light and food industries were to be developed.

New huge construction of all kinds was planned. During the five-year plan, the fleet of excavators in construction was supposed to increase by about 2.5 times, scrapers - by 3 times, bulldozers - by 4 times, mobile cranes - by 4.5 times.

The ports of Leningrad, Odessa, Zhdanovsky, Novorossiysk, Makhachkala, Murmansk, Naryan-Mar, Riga, Klaipeda and the ports of the Far East were to be capitally expanded.]

".. It is planned to increase the gross harvest of grain crops by 40-50 percent over the five years ...

High growth rates are being established in animal husbandry... Gross sales of meat and lard should increase by approximately 45-50 percent, milk by 45-50 percent, and wool by 2-2.5 times...

It is planned to increase the yield of grain crops per hectare: in the regions of South Ukraine and the North Caucasus up to 20-22 centners and on irrigated lands up to 30-34 centners; in areas

196

Volga region up to 14-15 centners and on irrigated lands up to 25-28 centners; in the Central Black Earth regions up to 16-18 centners and on irrigated lands up to 30-34 centners; in the non-chernozem zone up to 17-19 centners; in the regions of the Urals, Siberia and North-Eastern Kazakhstan up to 15-16 centners and on irrigated lands up to 24-26 centners; in the regions of Transcaucasia up to 20-22 centners and on irrigated lands up to 30-34 centners ... "

[It was planned to set up less than 2.5 million hectares of protective forest plantations in collective farms and state farms and about 2.5 million hectares of crops and plantations of state forests (as it turned out, so that the current rulers would ruthlessly destroy these forests with an ax and fire - S.K.).

It was planned to build up to 35,000 ponds and reservoirs on collective farms and state farms.]

"... The milk yield per cow on the collective farms of the non-chernozem zone is supposed to be increased to 1800-2000 kilograms, in the Central Chernozem regions to 1700-2000 kilograms, on state farms to 3500-3900 kilograms...

In 1955 it is planned to sell 90 percent of meat products to the population; fish products — by 70 percent; animal oils - by 70 percent; cheese - 2 times and sugar 2 times more than in 1950.

[Sales of furniture were to increase by 3 times, and sewing machines by 2.4 times; 2 times - radios and televisions.

Only through state construction, 105 million square meters of housing were to be built (In Rossiyanie, 41 million square meters were commissioned in 1995, and even 36.4 million in 2003, which was a failure " rollback" compared to

197

80s in the RSFSR, but, as we see, even in comparison with the USSR half a century ago, "Rossiyanie" looks untenable. - S.K.).

A transition from 7-year to 10-year polytechnical education was envisaged, with an increase in the number of students in grades 8-10 in urban schools by 4 times and in rural schools by 4.5 times compared with 1950.

It is worth noting that the report of the chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR highlighted the tasks for the five-year plan for the development of the three Baltic republics and the increase in the training of teaching staff with higher education in them.

The Directives adopted on the basis of the report provided for the growth of production in the following amounts:

cast iron - by 76%; steel - by 62%; rental — by 64%; coal - by 43%; oil — by 75%; electricity — by 80%; steam turbines - 2.3 times; hydro turbines - 7.7 times; oil equipment - 3.5 times; large metal-cutting machines — 2.6 times; cotton fabrics - by 61%; footwear — by 55%; sugar - by 78%; meat - by 92%; fish — by 58%; animal oil - by 72%; vegetable oil — by 77%; canned food - 2.1 times.]

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Even a cursory acquaintance with the Directives of the 19th Congress convinces us of their powerful potential and the scale of quite real ideas. However, from the standpoint of today, the most interesting and surprising thing in these Directives was that they did not contain a word about the notorious "development of virgin and fallow lands", which began to be trumpeted from the spring of 1954

of the year.

Speaking at the congress, the Kazakhstani secretary Shayakhmetov, speaking of "huge successes", noted only "insufficient attention of the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR to the development of animal husbandry in Kazakhstan."

And that's it!

In the Directives themselves, in the section on agriculture, it was only said about Kazakhstan that it was necessary to ensure "the creation of high-yielding hayfields and pastas" there.

198

habitats through the use of local irrigation and the use of artesian waters in order to gradually reduce long-distance cattle transhumance.

There was no talk of any "Tselina"! And this was quite understandable: objectively, the country had no time for virgin lands, especially in Kazakhstan.

During the war, the Germans burned and destroyed 70 thousand Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian villages and villages, ruined and plundered 98 thousand collective farms, 1876 state farms, while even in areas that were not occupied, the material and technical base of agriculture was - Noah is severely undermined.

And all this had to be restored - in the RSFSR in the Ukrainian SSR in the BSSR, which was provided for by the Directives.

Directives for any post-war five-year plan for the development of the Soviet economy are a document ten times over thought out and calculated. In the late USSR, Stalin learned to plan based on the real possibilities and needs of the country and planned well, and the plans themselves were tense precisely because they included intensive indicators without any latent reserves.

In other words, if in 1955-1959 the plan did not provide for the introduction of the virgin lands of Kazakhstan into circulation, then it should not have been.

And suddenly, almost immediately after the assassination of Stalin and the liquidation of Beria, like a devil from a box, this strangely hasty project appears in the life of the USSR.

In September 1953, the next Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU was convened. He introduces the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee, to which Khrushchev is elected. And on September 7, 1953, the same Plenum adopts a resolution "On measures for the further development of agriculture in the USSR", which states its crisis state.

This assessment was to a large extent true, but the reasonable solution was to sharply increase funding for the rise of collective farms and state farms in the Russian Non-Black Earth region and the creation in the European part of the USSR, primarily in the RSFSR, Ukraine and Belarus, of a modern agricultural base. There were huge growth reserves here,

199

and the political effect would be very relevant - after all, it was these regions that suffered the most from the war.

However, at the end of February and the beginning of March 1954, another plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU was convened, mainly on agricultural issues. On February 23, Khrushchev made a report, and on March 2, 1954, the resolution of the Plenum "On a further increase in grain production and on the development of virgin and fallow lands" was issued. The areas of new grain production are Western and Eastern Siberia, the Far East, the Urals, the North Caucasus, but above all the Kazakh SSR.



(In parentheses, I will inform you that in the same March, namely, on March 13, 1954, for some reason, on the 13th, the USSR State Security Committee was formed, which by the end of the 80s became one of the most important tools for the destruction of the USSR .)

In 1954, the lands of the Kiev, Smolensk, Poltava, Kharkiv, Oryol, Kursk, Bryansk, Belgorod, Sumy and many other regions of Russia and Ukraine, not to mention the lands of Belarus, still bore the terrible marks of war . In addition to statistics, one can recall the deeply realistic rural essays by the outstanding Soviet writer Valentin Ovechkin – they accurately describe the situation of the post-war village and its problems. A worn-out fleet of cars, a shortage of workers, obviously insufficient construction ...

And now all that equipment, all the forces and personnel, which were so lacking for agriculture in the European part of the Union, were poured in a wave to distant lands, into the windswept desert steppe.

In 1954, Voroshilov came to the Smolensk region. He was amazed at what he saw there, and at the same time threw out a phrase in his hearts that even if you appoint Karl Marx as the chairman of the collective farm, he will not be able to do anything. But at the same time, Voroshilov doubted whether it was necessary to make distant Kazakhstan with an undeveloped infrastructure the center of efforts - wouldn't it be better, they say, to revive the same Smolensk region?

Molotov and Malenkov asked the same questions, but it was already too late. By betraying Beria and giving the country into the hands

200

Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites, among whom were also agents of influence, Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, and themselves were increasingly deprived of the right to vote and the opportunity to influence the situation.

In 1954-1955, 40 large machine and tractor stations (MTS) were created in virgin lands development areas, where 120,000 tractors (in 15-horsepower terms) and 23,000 combines were sent. 425 new state farms received 136,000 tractors (in terms of 15 horsepower) and 55,000 combines.

As the reader knows, on November 6, 1951, L.P. Beria, in his report at the solemn meeting of the Moscow City Council, reported: "Agriculture annually receives a large number of the latest machines from the state. This year it will receive 137,000 tractors converted to 15 horsepower, 54,000 grain harvesters, of which 29,000 are self-propelled, as well as two million other agricultural machines and implements."

Comparing the "virgin" figures with the figures for the all-Union production of agricultural machinery, one can UNDERSTAND THAT the "virgin" adjustments of the Directives of the 19th Congress actually blew up these Directives! Carefully weighed plans flew to hell...

In the 6th volume of Brezhnev's "History of the Socialist Economy of the USSR" it is said that in 1953 "a little more than 31 million tons of grain were harvested (by the state. - S.K.), and more than 32 million tons were used, which forced the partial use of state reserves.

But everything was in real time, not so catastrophic! In general, already in 1950, the USSR produced 81.2 million tons of grain, and even in 1945 - 47.3 million tons (in 1940 - 95.6 million tons, while in 1941, if not war, the collection would obviously have exceeded 100 million tons without any virgin soil).

The reasonable line was clear - to accelerate the traditional areas of grain production with an all-round increase in productivity there (which, in fact, the Stalinist Directives for the five-year plan and provide for -

201

elk). Instead, since 1954, 350,000 young men and women, having received a ticket from the Komsomol committee, left for the "development of virgin lands" and sang: "We, friends, are going to distant lands, we will become new settlers of ita iya ..."

In 1954-1955, 33 million hectares of new land were plowed across the USSR, 18 million of them in Kazakhstan.

The first harvest on the lands that had never known a plow before was the richest, only most of it rotted in virgin ravines, because the grain receiving points were not ready to process such a quantity of it, and insufficiently developed infrastructure did not allow to take out the grain previously uninhabited places.

In 1954, Kazakhstan produced 250 million poods (4 million tons) of grain, 150 million poods (2.4 million tons) more than before. An increase that the traditional areas of grain production could well have given if the Khrushchevites had not "ripped off" them in favor of virgin lands. At the same time, the first Kazakh crop, as already mentioned, to a large extent simply rotted along the ravines.

1955 was a lean year in the virgin lands. And only in 1956, Kazakhstan "gave the country the first Kazakh billion poods of bread", that is, 16 million tons. At the same time, in two years, the sown area was increased to 27 million hectares.

Simple arithmetic shows that the average yield in Kazakhstan was "awesome" - about 6 centners per hectare.

The directives of the congress provided for an increase in productivity in North-East Kazakhstan to 15-16 centners and on irrigated lands to 24-26 centners, but, firstly, by 1959, and secondly (and this is the most significant) — on fundamentally smaller sown areas!

The Russian and Ukrainian villages did not receive the essentials, and huge funds continued to be invested in Tselina. Instead of restoring the Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian villages that suffered, were devastated by the war and occupation, the construction of virgin villages began.

202

kov in the middle of nowhere. New highways and railways were built in Kazakhstan and Siberia.

Such an unexpected, previously unplanned redistribution of all-Union funds hit the Russian countryside especially hard. And today we can confidently assert that the anti-people and asocial policy of Brezhnevism in relation to "unpromising villages" had its origins in the "virgin epic" of Khrushchevism.

Here are the figures for the gross grain harvest in the USSR by years: 1950 - 81.2 million tons; 1951 - 78.7 million tons; 1952 - 92.2 million tons; 1953 - 82.5 million tons; 1954 - 85.6 million tons; 1955 - 103.7 million tons; 1956 - 125 million tons; 1957 - 102 million tons; 1958 - 134.7 million tons; 1959 - 119.5 million tons; 1960 - 125.5 million tons.

And here are the figures for yields in centners per hectare: 1949 - 6.9; 1950 - 7.9; 1951 - 7.4; 1952 - 8.6; 1953 - 7.8; 1954 - 7.7; 1955 - 8.4; 1956 - 9.9; 1957 - 8.4; 1958 - 11.1; 1959 - 10.4.

As we can see, in general, the planned task of the Directives to increase grain production was fulfilled: instead of 81.5 million tons in 1950, 119.5 million tons were produced in 1959, that is, almost one and a half times more.

However, all the outlines of the Directives on productivity were frustrated. And this means that the growth in grain production was not ensured by intensive, as envisaged by the Stalinist plan,

development, but due to Khrushchev's extensive development.

Stalin's plan was to lay a solid foundation for a new powerful upsurge in the countryside.

Khrushchev's "development" doomed Soviet agriculture to permanent stagnation, which was the reality of the 1960s and later. But wasn't the "virgin" epic, for which the Komsomol received the Order of Lenin, became one of the reasons for the catastrophic failure of the USSR in the field of agriculture?

Yes, at that time the Soviet people were proud of the Virgin Land, and at the level of the masses, its development bordered on a feat, it was a movement of enthusiasts. But after decades, it becomes CLEAR that Tselina became the first major adventure

203

Khrushchevites, the consequences of which stretched out for many years.

So where did all these "virgin plans" come from after the death of Stalin and Beria?

The country needed grain - no doubt. If funds were invested in the agriculture of the European zone, then the return would not be as quick as in the development of virgin lands, but it would be a lasting success, and a triple success - economic, political and social.

However, the reality is different...

Why?

There is hardly any doubt that for Khrushchev personally, "Tselina" became an adventure quite in his style. For the growing Khrushchevite partopiasm, Tselina became an opportunity to curry favor.

But for the agents of influence of the West, which are increasingly strengthening their positions in the Khrushchev USSR, "Tselina" has become, it seems, the first major successful action to strategically undermine the USSR and Soviet socialism.

Alas, this sabotage was successful from every point of view.

And now - about Lavrenty Pavlovich directly ...

I am sure that if L.P. Beria was alive in the autumn of 1953, he would have resolutely and sharply opposed the plans for laying a "virgin" "mine" under the decisions of the 19th Congress. Surely he would not have allowed the USSR to undermine the Stalinist Directives on the planned development of agriculture.

Beria has always been a supporter of the optimization of efforts, an adherent of the regime of reasonable economy and an opponent of excesses. Already after the death of Stalin, on the initiative of Beria, a number of expensive, but not urgently needed, projects such as a tunnel to Sakhalin Island under the Tatar Strait were curtailed. Therefore, there is no doubt that Beria would not have allowed the "virgin" adventure to unfold.

However, by the autumn of 1953, the last great manager of socialism had been killed, and the triumphant bastard of all stripes could frolic with might and main.

Here she frolic.

204

From the speech of the second secretary of the CPSU MGK E. Furtseva

From the compiler and commentator:

Below are some of the most striking and interesting passages from the speech of Ekaterina Furtseva, the future Minister of Culture of the USSR, and then the Second Secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee.

"In Moscow, more than one third of all communists work in ministries and Soviet institutions. Recently, party organizations have begun to exert a greater influence on improving the work of the apparatus... Quite a few facts have been uncovered at reporting and election party meetings in ministries... manifestations of red tape and bureaucracy...

At party meetings, it was noted that official correspondence had increased significantly in a number of ministries and departments. In 1949, the Ministry of the Fishing Industry of the USSR received an average of 178 letters and telegrams per day, and in 1952 - 1114, that is, 6 times more. The growth of correspondence is explained not only by the fact that the volume of work has increased and the tasks have become more complicated, but, to a greater extent, by the fuzzy work of the apparatus, causing repeated letters and requests from the field, by large intra-ministerial correspondence, often replacing the prompt resolution of issues.

So, for example, in the Ministry of Oil Industry of the USSR 10 percent. all correspondence is made up of internal correspondence between central administrations, departments and departments ...

I want to give just one example. May 31st the Ministry of the River Fleet of the USSR received a letter from the Deputy Chairman of the USSR Gosplan with

205

a request to move an important cargo. On June 5, the answer to this letter was prepared by the main department and handed over for signature to Deputy Minister of the River Fleet Comrade Vakhturov. This document lay with him for 6 days and returned with the inscription: "Refresh". The letter was "refreshed" (cheerful animation in the hall), four new visas were put in and sent again to Comrade Vakhturov. Comrade Vakhturov's letter again lay for 8 days and returned to the central office, this time with a note: "Written poorly." (Laughter). The answer was "strengthened", they put five new visas, but after 5 days the letter returned again, this time without any resolutions, just crossed out. Finally, on June 30, another resolution of comrade Vakhturov appeared on the newly compiled answer: "To the deputy head of the main department, comrade Solovyov. I informed Gosplan about the measures taken by phone and we will not send a letter. Thus, it took 30 days of fruitless correspondence, while the issue could be resolved within a few minutes ...

<...>

...Fellows, a serious brake on the development of criticism and self-criticism is nepotism and vestiges of groupism, which still exist in a number of organizations. What kind of criticism and criticism itself can we talk about, say, at the Physical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where 102 employees are related (animation in the hall, laughter), and some of them are directly subordinate to each other.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

What Furtseva spoke about in 1952, and which Stalin's planned reforms could well have outlived, after Stalin's death blossomed into a full-blown bureaucratic thistle under Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

206

From the speech of the head of the Special Sector of the Central Committee of the CPSU A.N. Poskrebyshov

From the compiler and commentator:

I have long come to the conclusion that Poskrebyshov delivered a speech at the congress prepared in all its main parts personally by Stalin.

Formally, Stalin spoke at the congress once - on October 14, at the closing of the congress. However, Poskrebyshev, always emphatically modest, emphatically inconspicuous and emphatically dependent person, could never show any serious initiative in anything, not even because of some of his personal qualities, but simply because if he he dared to do it, then all the same everyone would consider that the initiative comes from Comrade Stalin, and Proskrebyshev is nothing more than a performer. Everyone understood this, Poskrebyshev understood, and, naturally, Stalin himself could not help but understand.

With all this, Poskrebyshev's speech, although at first glance it was devoted to an important, but private issue - the need to strengthen party and state discipline, in fact, had the most important and formidable meaning. That is why there can be no doubt that Stalin spoke through Poskrebyshev.

But he spoke in such a way that, with all the menacing and seriousness of the warning, it would not be perceived as a harbinger of new large-scale "shooting" purges in the party and state leadership and apparatus.

Comrades! The present 19th Congress of the Communist Party represents a major milestone in the history of the heroic struggle of our Party for the building of a communist society in our country.

The historical significance of the 19th Party Congress lies precisely in the fact that in its decisions the task of

207

the structure of communism is defined as the main task for this period of time.

<...>

The building of communism is the creativity of millions, it is the inexhaustible initiative of the working people, innovation and a merciless struggle against everything old, obsolete and bureaucratic, this is a high level of organization and discipline of people, this is truly universal labor heroism, this is an unusually increased culture of the working people of town and countryside. . Of course, in all this we have made great achievements. However, the level of consciousness of people still lags behind their material existence. The task, therefore, is to overcome this lag to the maximum extent and in the shortest possible time ...

Along with the army of many millions of working people who are selflessly building communism, we have individual people who, instead of actively participating in creative work, sit and wait for the onset of communism as some kind of "heavenly paradise". They sit and ask the question: "When, finally, will communism be proclaimed and how soon will we receive from society according to our needs?" (Laughter in the hall.)

These people apparently do not understand, or do not want to understand, that the building of communism is a complex and difficult process requiring strenuous material and spiritual effort; This means that communism can come the sooner, the better and more organized the work of all Soviet citizens capable of work...

Everyone knows how labor discipline has improved in our country, especially in industry and transport. But that is precisely why people who violate labor discipline cannot be tolerated in our team...

208

The facts show that ... violations of labor discipline occur due to the lack of proper order at individual enterprises, due to violations by managers of the legislation on work, the lack of due care for the material and everyday needs of the workers, and finally, due to poorly organized political and educational work.

The inspection carried out by the Central Committee of the Party of the work of a number of regional committees, regional committees, the Central Committee, and the Communist Party of the Union Republics in directing the matter of selecting, placing and educating leading cadres ... showed that many Party organizations were not sufficiently engaged in this work.

Major mistakes and shortcomings revealed by the Central Committee in the work with personnel are taking place in many ministries and departments. The heads of some ministries and central departments are not really engaged in the selection and education of cadres, ..remove themselves from work with cadres, shifting it entirely to the staff of the apparatus.

The requirement of the new Rules that a member of the Party in any position must unswervingly carry out the instructions of the Party on the correct selection of cadres according to their political and business qualities will be of great importance for ... improving all our Party and Soviet work.

<...>

Lenin and Stalin teach us that the slightest lawlessness is the hole that our enemies use to try to undermine our social and state system.

But we have enemies, the capitalist encirclement continues to exist. It is no coincidence that the insolent US imperialists are allocating huge

sums for subversive work in the USSR and in the countries of people's democracy. We must not forget this...

It can be said without any exaggeration that many of the negative phenomena taking place in our social life often result from the fact that an incorrect attitude towards party and state discipline and towards our Soviet legislation has taken root in the minds of some of our workers.

The draft of the new Rules says very well and precisely that there cannot be two disciplines in the Party—one for the leaders, the other for the rank and file. The party has one discipline. One law for all communists, regardless of their merits and positions. This means that Party and Soviet laws are the same for everyone without exception.

Soviet legislation, as an area of the socialist superstructure, plays a very important and active role in strengthening and developing the socialist basis.

In the Soviet country, for the first time in history, the law has become the embodiment of the will and interests of the working masses, and therefore the implementation of Soviet laws for the working people of our country is a matter of honor, a high patriotic duty.

Unfortunately, we have among the Party and Soviet workers (note that economic workers are not mentioned here. - S.K.) those who for some reason are sure that it is not they who are obliged to comply with the laws, but someone else, but that they themselves can circumvent the laws, violate or apply them at their own discretion, according to the principle: "The law that went where it turned, it went there." (About living in the hall.)

210

There is no doubt that from such a very strange understanding of the laws there is only one step to ... a crime  
niyu.

<...>

Our successes are grandiose and can give rise to erroneous moods, moods of ceremonial well-being and complacency among people who are not politically sufficiently tempered.

The Party teaches not to revel in successes, to soberly evaluate them, to notice shortcomings in work in time (as in the text. - S.K.), ... teaches intransigence to shortcomings. The Party has always regarded criticism and self-criticism as the driving force behind the development of Soviet society, a permanent weapon in the Party's arsenal, inextricably linked with the very nature and spirit of our Party, as a revolutionary transforming force in society.

The new Statute states that party members not only have the right, but are also obliged to develop criticism and self-criticism in every possible way.

Criticism and self-criticism is a powerful force capable of doing miracles if it is skillfully used, if it is used honestly, openly, in the Bolshevik way.

Criticism and self-criticism are effective when they are based on public interests, the interests of the state, when personal considerations, personal motives are thrown away, when people who are strong in their rightness, their conviction, openly and mercilessly, really regardless of the faces, opened they expose and expose everything that hinders our victorious advance.

<...>

There are ... cases when some noble officials, abusing their power, inflict reprisals for criticism, directly or indirectly subjected to

211

subject to repression and persecution. (Further emphasis is mine. — S.K.) But everyone knows how severely our party and its Central Committee punish such nobles, regardless of their ranks, ranks, or past merits.

Our Party attaches particular importance to criticism from below, criticism from ordinary people, criticism with the aim of improving things.

For some reason, some leaders believe that only their subordinates are allowed to criticize, and subordinates, you see, have no right to criticize their superiors. This strange understanding of criticism and self-criticism has nothing to do with partisanship. A leader who in words acknowledges criticism, but in deed protects himself from criticism from his subordinates, deliberately digs a gulf between himself and the masses. Meanwhile, criticism and self-criticism should not separate, but unite the leading and rank-and-file workers into a single healthy and workable team.

Criticism and self-criticism are not respected only by people with a bad conscience; they are either violators of party and state discipline, or despicable cowards, or pitiful philistines unworthy of bearing the high title of party member.

Those employees who think that criticism and self-criticism belittle the leader and undermine his authority, even, as some say, trample people into the dirt, are deeply mistaken. These absurd judgments are not worth refuting. Criticism and self-criticism do not belittle, but elevate a person, pull him out of the swamp. This is a clean stream of water that washes away dirt, philistine and other vices from people.

212

Our Party has received for its ideological armament a powerful new theoretical weapon, a new program document, a precious contribution to the theory of Marxism-Leninism—the just published work of Comrade Stalin, The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.

<...>

Comrade Stalin showed a wonderful example of a critical analysis of the mistakes and anti-Marxist attitudes of individual economists...

<...> There are still areas of science that have not been touched by the fresh wind of criticism and self-criticism - this is on

For example, legal science, ..in recent years there has not been any serious discussion on the most topical, vital issues of state and law. It cannot be said that there were no discussions at all... But what kind of problems are discussed at these discussions? For example, for a long time the "problem" of what is guilt and what is guilt has been heatedly discussed. Some say that these are one and the same, others said that these are different concepts, others believe that guilt should be understood in a narrow and broad sense. They argued and argued and hopelessly confused this question. (Laughter in the auditorium.) And now, as sober people say, without wine there is no way to understand wine (in the auditorium, laughter. Applause).

Meanwhile, what an boundless field for legal scholars in the study of really topical issues of state and law...

Many issues of public and state life that require strict legislative regulation have not yet found their positive resolution.

213

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

The following second major block of Poskrebyshev's speech was also outlined, of course, by Stalin's hand, since the question was raised of principle, the most important. But if it had been set by Stalin himself, the necessary painstaking and long-term state legislative work could have resulted in campaignism and hallelujahism. There were sad precedents, especially since lawyers are flexible people.

Therefore, Stalin decided to designate the legal problem through Poskrebyshev, as well as the problem of improving the management of public education and its coordination and unification on an all-Union scale, which remained outside the brackets of the text cited here.

Stalin attached more and more importance to the last aspect of the life of Soviet society, which is clearly seen from the corresponding passages in The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, which speak of the need for polytechnic education, etc.

Further strengthening of the socialist legal order and state discipline requires the unification of individual areas of Soviet legislation on an all-Union scale.

<...>

I will give just one example: for taking a bribe committed without aggravating circumstances, the legislation of the RSFSR provides for imprisonment for up to 2 years, the Azerbaijan SSR - up to 3 years, the Turkmen SSR - up to 5 years, and in the Byelorussian SSR - up to 10 years . (Laughter in the hall.)

.The question is, what national, "climatic" or other features can explain such disparity? (Animation in the hall.)

Other areas of Soviet legislation (such as civil, labor, etc.) also need to be streamlined.

214

Closing speech by I.V. Stalin at the 19th Congress of the CPSU



From the compiler and commentator:

Stalin made a final speech at the congress. At the same time, he "did not please", for example, the historian Yu.N. Zhukov by the fact that instead of "summing up," as Yu. Zhukov writes, "the result of an implicit, hidden discussion," he delivered a short speech, which the same Zhukov assessed as "far from pressing concerns, from real position of the country, from the struggle in the narrow leadership "...

This "struggle in a narrow leadership" was given to modern historians!

Well, for the sake of what, one wonders, was it necessary to wage this "struggle", for example, Beria and Kaganovich?

What if one of them "won" in the "struggle for power" and got two or three extra sectors of the economy under his hand, this would lead to the winner receiving new controlling stakes, or to marriage on the next top model, or provide a new yacht to sail the waves of the Mediterranean?

No, the members of the Stalinist team had enough power to the brim, and only one person in it was power-hungry - Khrushchev. It was he who, solely for the sake of retaining personal power, carried out in June 1957 a virtual anti-Party coup, falsely accusing Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich of organizing an alleged "anti-Party group". But Khrushchev was an anti-party adventurer. It was he, in the spring of 1957, publicly, in front of the whole world, with the confidence of a political idiot, who promised to catch up and overtake the United States of America by 1960 in the production of meat and milk per capita! This was opposed by the "anti-party group", for which it was expelled by the leading party plasm from the leadership of the party and the country.

Actually, it was from that moment that the future of socialism in the USSR was under threat, which in 1991 was realized.

As for Stalin's speech at the congress, it was delivered not only with the new real provisions

215

the USSR, but also became an emphatic demonstration of this new situation. After all, the 19th Congress of Soviet Communists for the first time openly gathered in its hall the leaders of all leftist forces on the planet.

Stalin emphasized this new position of the CPSU and the USSR, speaking in the spirit that all progressive people in the world can consider the CPSU and the USSR as their "advanced brigade", marching in the vanguard of the movement towards a just and humane order of life. At the same time, he said that such an arrangement of life is quite possible if all people of good will and all the healthy forces of the planet join their efforts precisely in the name of this.

Stalin clearly directed the leftist forces in the world to become the leading force of the nation in order to ensure success for their peoples in the struggle for socialism. And at the same time, he emphasized that by defending the interests of their peoples, the international left forces help the Soviet Union, and by supporting the USSR they help, and not even including, but above all, themselves.

Stalin spoke the absolute truth. The broad masses of Western Europe received ever-increasing social guarantees, primarily because, since 1917, the state of workers has existed on the planet. And the more this state grew stronger, the greater part of the social "pie" had to be shared by Capital with the people of Labor... By the very fact of its power, the Soviet Union worked for the benefit of the peoples of the world.

And what about the "urgent concerns of the country", which Yuri Zhukov cares so much about? So after all, Stalin spoke about the most urgent concern of the USSR - the preservation of peace! Today's historians like to quote the catchphrase of Pyotr Stolypin, whom they revere, a very ordinary figure compared to any member of the Stalinist team, that you need great upheavals, but we need a great Russia, and that give Russia twenty quiet years, and she will be unrecognizable.

But after all, Stalin could have said the same, and with much greater justification, after the end of the war. The Soviet Union needed peace to the same extent that the imperialist bloc needed, if not war, then militia.

216

organized economy. The historian Zhukov cannot fail to know what scope, and above all thanks to the efforts of the USSR, the worldwide peace movement acquired in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Communism became synonymous with peace and life.

Capitalism finally became the enemy of the world, peoples and the planet itself. Stalin about this said.

And what could be more relevant then and now? After all, the world is increasingly turning into a spiritual and physical garbage dump, and only and exclusively capitalism bears responsibility for this.

Stalin spoke about this as well.

And he said like this...

Comrades!

Permit me to express gratitude on behalf of our congress to all the fraternal parties and groups whose representatives honored our congress with their presence or who sent addresses of greetings to the congress—for the friendly greetings, for the wishes of success, for the trust.

This trust is especially valuable to us, which means readiness to support our Party in its struggle for a bright future for the peoples, in its struggle against war, in its struggle for the preservation of peace.

It would be a mistake to think that our party, which has become a powerful force, no longer needs support. This is not true. Our Party and our country have always needed and will continue to need the trust, sympathy and support of the fraternal peoples abroad.

The peculiarity of this support is that any support for the peace-loving aspirations of our Party on the part of any fraternal party means, at the same time, support for its own people in their struggle to preserve peace. When the British workers in 1918-1919 during

217

armed attack of the British bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union organized the struggle against the war under the slogan "Hands off Russia!", then it was support, first of all, the struggle of their people for peace, and then support for the Soviet Union. When Comrade Torez or Comrade Togliatti declare that their peoples will not fight against the Soviet Union, that is support, first of all, support for the workers and peasants of France and Italy, who are fighting for peace, and then support for the peace-loving aspirations of the Soviet Union. Union. This feature of mutual support is explained by the fact that the interests of our Party not only do not contradict, but, on the contrary, merge with the interests of the peace-loving peoples. As for the Soviet Union, its interests are generally inseparable from the cause of world peace.

It is clear that our Party cannot remain indebted to the fraternal parties, and it must itself, in turn, support them, as well as their peoples, in their struggle for liberation, in their struggle to preserve peace. As you know, she does just that. After our Party seized power in 1917 and after the Party had taken real measures to eliminate capitalist and landowner oppression, the representatives of the fraternal parties, admiring the successes and courage of our Party, awarded it the title of "Shock Brigade" of the world revolutionary and workers' movement.

By this they expressed the hope that the successes of the Shock Brigade would ease the situation for the peoples languishing under the yoke of capitalism. I think that our party justified these hopes, especially during the Second World War, when the Soviet people, having defeated the German and Japanese fascist

218

wound, delivered the peoples of Europe and Asia from the threat of fascist slavery.

Of course, it was very difficult to fulfill this honorary role while the "Shock Brigade" was the only one and so far it had to fulfill this advanced role almost alone. But it was. Now it's a completely different matter. Now that from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary new "shock brigades" have appeared in the person of people's democratic countries, now it has become easier for our party to fight, and the work has gone more cheerfully.

Particular attention deserves those communist, democratic and workers' and peasants' parties which have not yet come to power or which continue to work under the heel of bourgeois draconian laws. They are, of course, harder to work with. However, it is not as difficult for them to work as it was for us Russian communists during the period of tsarism, when the slightest movement forward was declared the gravest crime. However, the Russian communists persevered, were not afraid of difficulties and achieved victory. The same will happen with these parties.

Why, after all, will it not be so difficult for these parties to work in comparison with the Russian communists of the tsarist period?

Because, firstly, they have before their eyes such examples of struggle and success as exist in the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. Consequently, they can learn from the mistakes and successes of these countries and thus make their work easier.

Because, secondly, the bourgeoisie itself, the main enemy of the liberation movement, has become different, has changed in a serious way, has become more reactionary, has lost ties with the people and that

donkey

219

beat herself. It is clear that this circumstance should also facilitate the work of the revolutionary and democratic parties.

Sergey Kremlev's comment:

Alas, Stalin, who himself emphasized that the class struggle only intensifies with the strengthening of the USSR, overly optimistically assessed the potential of left-wing parties in capitalist countries and underestimated the ability and possibilities of Capital to decompose left-wing parties.

The concept of "labor aristocracy" appeared already in the 20th century, but after the Second World War, after the growing influence of the USSR and socialism, Capital had to greatly expand the layer of the "labor aristocracy", including a very significant part of the US population and capitalist countries of Europe. This was done by expanding the open and hidden exploitation of the industrially undeveloped, resource-rich countries of the world.

It was a forced measure — the example of the USSR supported it, but it was also a temporarily effective measure that delayed the final crisis of capitalism until the beginning of the 21st century.

But Stalin, speaking further about the actual elimination of individual freedom in capitalist countries, was essentially right. The development of personality became a factor of death for Capital, therefore it suppressed personality where it had a place to be, but above all, Capital from now on took care that personality as a mass concept would disappear altogether. And those increasingly moronic masses, those

The "soap generations" that we are witnessing today are the direct result of the anti-social policy of Capital.

Stalin also correctly said that the communist parties must raise the banner of democratic freedoms if they want to gather the majority of the people around them. Actually, for a certain period in the 50s and 60s, this line was maintained - as long as there were healthy forces in the leadership of the Western Communist Parties and until the degradation of the USSR, decomposed by agents of influence and self-seekers, became more and more clearly manifested.

220

Previously, the bourgeoisie allowed itself to be liberal, defended bourgeois-democratic freedoms and thus created popularity among the people. Now there is no trace left of liberalism. There is no longer so-called "freedom of the individual" – individual rights are now recognized only for those who have capital. and all other citizens are considered raw human material, suitable only for exploitation. The principle of equal rights of people and nations has been trampled underfoot, it has been replaced by the principle of the full rights of the exploiting minority and the lack of rights of the exploited majority of citizens (as is true for the current "Russian" "democracy" of the "United Russia"-Kremlin model. - S.K.). The banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms has been thrown overboard. I think that you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties, will have to raise this banner and carry it forward if you want to gather the majority of the people around you. There is no one else to pick it up.

Previously, the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation, it defended the rights and independence of the nation, putting them "above all." Now there is not a trace left of the "national principle". Now the bourgeoisie is selling the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. (How true this is for today's "Rossiyanian", which is being dragged by the Kremlin into the WTO and transferring its army to NATO technical and moral standards. — S.K.) There is no doubt that you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties, will have to raise this banner, and carry it forward if you want to be patriots of your country, if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is no one else to raise it.

221

That is how things stand at the present time.

It is clear that all these circumstances should facilitate the work of the communist and democratic parties that have not yet come to power.

Consequently, there is every reason to count on the success and victory of the fraternal parties in the countries the dominance of capital.

Long live our fraternal parties!

May the leaders of the fraternal parties live and prosper!

Long live peace among nations!

Down with warmongers!

Concluding comment by Sergei Kremlev:

Stalin's speech at the 19th Congress became his political testament, and in world history there is no other such socially optimistic testament of a great politician to mankind.

Lavrenty Beria did not leave such a document - in the early 50s he did not think about death and hoped to live for at least another twenty years.

Failed...

## CONTENT

Publisher's preface. .... 5th Congress of the All-Russian Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) - CPSU - not held

triumph of socialism ..... 10 Materials for the 19th Congress of the CPSU(b)-  
CPSU.... ..... 45 Reflections on socialism and the new Program of the CPSU... ahh. 64 Speeches  
by L.P. Beria of the last years of his life ..... 114 Report at the solemn meeting of the Moscow

Council November 6, 1951 (abbreviated) ..... 115 Speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU(b)-CPSU

October 7, 1952 ..... 144 Funeral speech at the funeral of I.V. Stalin

March 9, 1953 ..... 175 Afterword by the Publisher ..... 184

Application. .... A. 195

Literary and artistic edition

## SPETSHRAN. SENSATIONAL MEMOIRS

Beria Lavrenty Pavlovich

"LIVE ANOTHER 20 YEARS!"

Beria's latest posts

Published in the author's edition Managing editor L. Nezvinskaya Art editor S. Kurbatov

Technical editor V. Kulagina Computer layout G. Razhikova Proofreader I. Goncharova

LLC "Yauza-press" 109439, Moscow, Volgogradsky pr-t, 120, bldg. 2. Tel.: (495) 745-58-23, fax 411-68-86-2253.

Signed for publication on February 20, 2012. Format 84x108 1/32. Headset "Journal". Offset printing. Conv.  
oven I. 11.76.

Circulation 7000 copies. Order 4238

Printed from electronic media of the publisher. OAO "Tver Polygraphic Plant". 170024, Tver, Lenin Ave., 5 -  
mmm ŷuerk gi E-mail (E-mail) - ŷŷŷŷŷ@ŷŷŷŷŷ.ŷŷ \$

18m 978-5-9955-0405-4

CHI

85995" 504054

MAJOR HISTORICAL SENSATION! The last book of L.P. Beria, supplementing the publication of his personal diaries. These are not memoirs (Lavrenty Pavlovich was thinking more not about the past, but about the future of the USSR) and not a dying confession (the atheist Beria did not think in such categories) - this is a POLITICAL BESTAMENT of the greatest statesman of the Stalin era, who was not only "the best manager of the twentieth century ", but also "brilliant

systems analyst. Reading Beria, you understand what an irreplaceable loss for Russia was his murder by enemies of the people.

"Comrade Stalin correctly presses on criticism and self-criticism, but you cannot wash a black dog white. You can't break through our bureaucrats with any speeches. What kind of bloodletting they were given in 1937 and 1938, and they, as they were dunduks and self-seekers, remained so ... Of course, then Yezhov let a lot of innocents under the monastery, but I fixed it, here my conscience is calm ... "

"Trotsky shouted about the world revolution and wanted to sacrifice Russia to the world revolution. The fool was also an enemy. If we worked not for the USSR, but for the world revolution, there would be neither the USSR nor the revolution now. Trotsky shouted that a world conflagration was needed, but why a conflagration? Fire, it means everything will burn, why do we need it

'necessary? We need us to be a beacon, to shine and show the right course to others ... "

"It would be nice to live at least 20 more years. Who the hell knows what we can do in these 20 years! By 1964 we will have completed the sixth five-year plan, and by about 1970 we can have such a material level that even the American worker will envy ... Comrade Stalin sets the great task of achieving a 5-hour working day. If we succeed, it will be a great upheaval. We will bypass capitalism on this alone, they can't do that, give them profit, and workers for them - but how Russians can in 5 hours, and they live well. No, give us socialism and Soviet power too, we also want to live like people. This will be the peaceful offensive of communism ... "

I5VM 978-5-9955-0405-4

|| 785995" 504054"> "YAUZA-PRESS"